UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA STATESVILLE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	DOCKET NO). 5:12-CR-49
VS.)	VOLUME NO). I
MARTIN MARTINEZ SALDANA,)		
Defendant.)		
)		

TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. VOORHEES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
MARCH 4, 2014

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Government:

STEVEN KAUFMAN, ESQ. United States Attorney's Office 227 West Trade Street, Suite 1700 Charlotte, North Carolina

On Behalf of the Defendant:

DENZIL H. FORRESTER, ESQ. Law Office of Denzil Forrester, P.O. Box 32511 Charlotte, North Carolina

JESUS RICARDO CANALES, ESQ. Law Office of Rick Canales 845 East Harrison Street Brownsville, Texas

> Cheryl A. Nuccio, RPR, RMR, CRR Official Court Reporter United States District Court Charlotte, North Carolina

1	<u>INDEX</u>
2	GOVERNMENT'S WITNESSES PAGE
3	DUSTIN HARMON
4	Direct Examination By Mr. Kaufman 42 Cross Examination By Mr. Canales 81
5	Redirect Examination By Mr. Kaufman 131 Recross Examination By Mr. Canales 153
6	
7	EXHIBITS
8	GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBITS
9	<u>NUMBER</u> <u>ADMITTED</u>
10	1A
11	1C58
12	1E58
13	1G
14	19
15	30
16	3173
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

PROCEEDINGS

TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 4, 2014

(Court called to order at 9:45 a.m.)

THE COURT: Now, then, we'll take up the two motions in limine. The first one having to do with statements concerning the gun, that would be document number 70. Would the defendant want to add anything to what has already been set forth?

MR. FORRESTER: I think it's well briefed, Your

Honor, concerning -- I just want to make sure this one is

dealing with the religious -- actually, 70 would deal with --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. FORRESTER: -- the statements -- the religion or the gun? I think 70 deals with the -- specifically the guns.

THE COURT: Both.

MR. FORRESTER: Both, okay. Okay.

Concerning religion, Your Honor, certainly in my motion I outlined less than -- or approximately less than 10 percent of the population in this community is Roman Catholic. And to bring up an issue that is confusing in and of itself, as my exhibit will say, it certainly would almost prejudice the defendant. And the harm that exists is that in a rural part of North Carolina where -- and I'm not, here again, making any sort of disparaging remark to any potential venire persons, but I am saying the reality is this, is that

his faith should not become an argument or an issue in this matter. And to bring up some sort of worshiping of patron saints, that would skew it against my client. And certainly I would argue in the spirit of *Batson*, it certainly brings up some protected issues that should not necessarily go into the deliberation.

THE COURT: Well, let me say that I wouldn't expect a law enforcement officer testifying from his experience to say much, if anything, about worshiping or about Roman Catholicism or anything about religion as such. I would think he might say something to the effect that this religious artifact was found with other items belonging to the defendant indicating that he would have had knowledge that it was there and that it is commonly found in the possession of people who deal in drugs.

Is that a fair statement of what the government intends to show?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor, that is. And I believe that the commonly used term in the courts where it has been admitted is that Santa Muerte, she's known as the narco-trafficking saint. That's the term of art that we've seen in the case law. But we're not going into anything about any particular religion, whether it's Catholicism or otherwise. And in fact, if I'm not mistaken, Santa Muerte is not a sanctioned saint in the Catholic church. But we're

staying far away from that, from the topic of Catholicism.

These are tokens that are used almost as a good luck or protectionary token by trafficking -- traffickers. As we stated in our response to the motion in limine, and I believe also in our initial notice to the defense, Agent Harmon, who is actually to my right right now, I anticipate that part of his testimony will be that there are people who are not traffickers who will also have the Santa Muerte token. So that there is a balance to the testimony. It's not a conclusion. It's just simply based on training and experience.

THE COURT: The motion will be denied. And of course, at the time it comes up, if the -- I mean, obviously the defendant may want to object at that point, although you'll be given a continuing objection about it and that is done as of now. But if the foundation is not adequate or something otherwise is insufficient about the offer of the government, then the court would deal with it at that time.

MR. FORRESTER: Can I now address the gun?
THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. FORRESTER: Okay. Your Honor, to be brief, I think the Supreme Court addressed this issue and the Fourth Circuit certainly did in a case called *United States versus Robinson*, 625 3d Edition 920 -- I'm sorry, 941, at page 953. And certainly, I'm making reference when I speak about the

Supreme Court, the case is Watson versus United States. It's a 2007 case that specifically is saying that even in the conveyance where someone is trading drugs for guns, that certainly does not necessarily reach the prima facie evidence to say that a weapon was used in furtherance of drug trafficking.

So certainly when -- we just want to basically preclude testimony of a client who is carrying a gun in his waist or a client who is shooting a gun at his property because certainly those mundane acts, meaning that certainly if someone has a weapon or is alleged to have a weapon on their property, certainly there's nothing -- I'm not saying it's all that innocuous, but there is certainly nothing malicious about that nor is there anything malicious about someone who is cutting their grass and have a -- and has a weapon in his or her waistband.

And I think certainly it's important because if you cannot in the midst of a drug deal -- if the Supreme Court has said, well, you know what, we have to look to see if the gun was used in furtherance of drug trafficking. Then certainly pushing your lawn mower or shooting a weapon in the back yard is remote from drug trafficking.

So my thing is that that bridge, that barrier has not been crossed and we don't necessarily want to cross it on any sort of speculation or innuendo. That's why I think any

such statements like that should be kept out, Your Honor. I think I stand firmly on the Supreme Court's ruling concerning that.

THE COURT: All right, sir. I think the rulings to which you refer are not apposite in this context. They go as far as they go, but they don't reach the testimony that's being offered here. So that motion will be overruled.

If it turns out that the government goes beyond what we believe from the motion that it will offer, we'll take that up at the time.

Anything else the attorneys would like to have the court address at this point before we recess to get the jury assembled properly?

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, with regard to the proposed voir dire by the defense, which is document 76 in the docket, while it's not required for them to provide that in advance, I do thank the defense for doing that and it may help make things go smoothly.

We do take issue with some of the questions and so if we can hash these out now, it may make voir dire smoother.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. KAUFMAN: First of all, with regard to on page 1 of the document, number 4, defense asks, Do you all understand that a jury -- sorry, as a jury you are each equal among peers and not followers among a leader?

And my concern is that it's telling -- it's trying to get the jury to agree that they are almost to make their own decisions, which is true, but not listen to that of others. And I think that our concern is that the jury has to be able to listen to others, keep their minds open and deliberate with the possibility of either keeping their initial opinion the same or changing it. Otherwise, people will have a -- and I believe that the judge's -- Your Honor's instructions to the jury say keep an open mind; whereas, this one almost makes it sound like you can't follow what other people are saying.

THE COURT: Well, I make a comment about that and I trust the attorneys to abide by -- generally speaking you accurately stated the duty to deliberate, that is, to hear what all jurors have to say and then make up one's mind. But talking about leaders and followers, I think, is probably over the line in an effort to place in the juror's mind something they're not required or -- to do or not appropriately doing, and that is looking for somebody to be their leader. In any event, I think the attorneys -- the defense attorneys can handle that without any difficulty.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

With regard to number 7, the proposed voir dire starts off talking about a personal experience, being the victim of a breaking and entering, and then transitions into

asking if the jurors would be uncomfortable in a firearms trial.

I think that injecting that personal component not only is irrelevant and unnecessary, it's also a non sequitur to the ultimate question of the jury regarding firearms. I think -- I would ask that, you know, in order -- it almost is trying to inject sympathy for the defense counsel and I don't think it furthers the questioning of the jury.

THE COURT: I think it's quite normal to have questions to the jurors about whether they have any experience that might affect their ability to be fair. I don't know that it's necessary to bring up that trial counsel may have been the victim of a home invasion in particular. I think it might be best to suggest hypothetically that someone who might have been the victim of a home invasion might not be a good juror for that type of case. But having said that, I think the attorneys can abide by that commentary.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. KAUFMAN: With regard to number 9, the second question is, "Who would think that the defense did not put on any evidence if we did not call a witness?"

Ultimately I think it's actually a true statement. If they do not call a witness and aren't presenting exhibits, they're not putting on evidence. Obviously, part of the

evidence that the government is putting on is the direct and cross examination. But I think that it's kind of a trick question to the jury. If they don't put on a witness, they're not putting on evidence in their own case.

THE COURT: Well, it is kind of awkwardly worded the way number 9 is worded. I wouldn't expect counsel to follow that exact wording. The idea to convey to the jurors is that they're expected to -- it's often -- strike that.

It's often asked of jurors if they would hold it against the defendant if he did not take the stand. And moreover, they would be -- could be advised during questioning that the court would instruct them that they would not properly consider the fact that he didn't take the stand if he did not.

But as far as it being negative evidence, that's one way of saying a proper instruction, but I don't know that defense counsel would want to suggest that to the jury, that it might be negative evidence -- by asking the question you might put that in their minds that it is negative evidence.

MR. KAUFMAN: And, Your Honor, the last question, number 10, "Do you all promise not to incorporate any information learned about the defendant other than evidence at trial in your deliberations of his guilt or innocence?"

And ultimately the only information that they'll have about the defendant is from the evidence presented. So I

think this is also something that may confuse the jury as to what they learn about the defendant they can and cannot consider. And only that which Your Honor admits, which means all of the evidence presented is what they should consider.

THE COURT: Well, the court will handle this by instruction. Jurors will be told more than once that they are not to consider anything that they don't learn from evidence here at trial, and they'll be expected to follow that instruction. The attorneys can obviously refer to that in their voir dire questioning if they see fit. It would be kind of awkward to think -- to ask them to promise that they won't use information that they aren't supposed to have in the first place. We'll ask them -- we certainly appropriately ask jurors to promise that they will apply only the evidence they hear at the trial and nothing else.

But the way this question is phrased, it does sort of suggest that they might very well have information already learned from outside the trial. We will hopefully screen them from that by the time they get to this point. They will hear the preliminary instructions before we do the voir dire as the court normally does. So counsel can listen to my preliminary instructions as we go through them. And you've heard them before, I'm sure. And you may, of course, incorporate any of that information in your questions to jurors.

All right. Anything further, then?

MR. KAUFMAN: Nothing from the United States, Your Honor.

MR. FORRESTER: Your Honor, if I can just be heard just for the record.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. FORRESTER: Put this on the record.

Concerning question number 4, and I'll read it. I'm not sure if the interpreters have it. The question says, "Do you all understand that as a jury you each are equal among peers and not followers among a leader?"

I just want to put on the record that certainly from the defendant's point of view, the prosecution might be front running or referencing to matters that would be contained in an *Allen* charge because the question doesn't ask anyone to get into a state of mind of blind determination and that's basically for one, you know -- for *Allen* charge matters really.

So the question doesn't ask anyone to dig in and say, hey, blind determination, you are on an island here. The question just says to people -- venire persons that, look, whether you're a mechanic, whether you're a president of a company, just don't be intimidated by anyone else because of their station in life, whether you have a GED or whether you have five doctorates. The question --

THE COURT: The idea that the jurors are to consider

themselves equal among peers in terms of their deliberations is perfectly all right.

MR. FORRESTER: Okay. And for the record, the other one is not -- the point in that question -- and the court is certainly correct in saying it might have been awkwardly worded. But the point in that is to let the jurors know that certainly evidence is matter that's elicited and admitted into the trial by the court that comes from the witness stand. And so in cross examination, whether we put someone on or not, we can elicit evidence via testimony from the witness stand. Simple as that.

But additionally, if I submit a document and mark it for identification purposes only and foundation is laid, and this is -- and I present it to a prosecution witness, certainly after their case in chief, without putting a defendant on the stand or a defendant witness on the stand, if the foundation is proper and every other evidentiary rules are proper, certainly it's fine to ask for that to be admitted into evidence and submitted.

So I think to just paint a broad stroke and say, well, that question is wrong as the prosecution has said, I think that's swinging the pendulum all the way to the other end to where it does the opposite intention of fairness or justice. And I'll just leave that for the record. But I think everything else -- no need to argue about that. But I

think certainly 9 and 4, just want to leave those for the record.

any evidence that has come in, whether -- whatever witness it may have come from. And if the defendant didn't offer any evidence as such by way of testimony, defendant nevertheless can argue what is in evidence and argue inferences from what is not in evidence. But obviously you wouldn't want to draw attention -- undue attention to the fact that the defendant didn't take the stand other than to make clear to the jury that he's not required to and that the jury cannot hold that against him or otherwise draw any adverse inference from that.

All right. Thank you very much.

Anything further?

MR. CANALES: May I have a second, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

(Defense counsel conferred.)

MR. CANALES: For the record, Rick Canales, Judge.

Your Honor, I have a question -- if I can have some type of leave from the court where it is the defendant's intention for Mr. Forrester to do the jury selection, Judge. If there's any time allowed or if there is any time left over or any issues or something occurs, that I will be allowed to address the jury panel as well?

THE COURT: Well, usually the examination of the

I think

jurors takes about a half an hour. If it went twice that, I think I'd be concerned about it.

MR. CANALES: Yes, sir. Like if -- I guess if both of us can do some -- if I feel the need if I -- if the court would allow me also to do some type of --

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. CANALES: -- questioning --

THE COURT: You may.

MR. CANALES: -- as well.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Forrester, are you -- I take it you are familiar with the process by which the court goes through jury selection.

MR. FORRESTER: Yes, I am, Your Honor.

Mr. Canales was basically -- he was just showing reverence to the court by saying, Your Honor, certainly if I join in or tag team, will the court be offended by it. That's all.

Certainly he's a part of the defense and basically he's lead counsel, so -- but I just thought it would be a good opportunity for him to introduce himself again. I know yesterday he spoke to the court. So that's all.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I think that's appropriate and usually one attorney on a given side of the case will ask the questions of a given witness without having two counsel doing that. But in voir dire I have no objection

to co-counsel participating as they see fit.

But the main thing about jury selection, the way it's done in this courtroom, the government asks its questions of the jury; and if it has peremptory strikes, it announces those and the stricken jurors take a seat in the spectator area and the clerk replaces those jurors. But at that point the government has passed on all the other jurors. So then the government examines the new jurors until it's satisfied with them. Then the case goes over to the defense and they do likewise until they are satisfied. If someone has a strike for cause, sometimes you can just say motion because it's an obvious reason. If it's not obvious, you might want to —feel free to say it out loud or you can say it at the sidebar if you would rather.

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, I don't know if Your Honor has changed your procedure somewhat from the last time I appeared before you in trial. My concern about having one side do all of its potential strikes before the other and not alternating sides is that potentially we could establish a situation where the government has used any peremptory strikes it has and then the defense could in theory wipe out all of those jurors and then start selecting their own. Since we need to have a unanimous verdict and the defense only needs in theory one juror, what I would ask is if it could be alternating. The government obviously using its first series

1 of peremptories on the panel. Then the defense announces 2 theirs. And after those individuals are excused, to then have the defense go first and then the United States go so that 3 4 both sides are considering the same jurors at the same time. 5 THE COURT: Well, I'd simply say that that's never 6 come up in my 25 years on the bench. I don't think that's a 7 realistic concern on your part. If it were, we might have to tinker with the rule a little bit. The court has some 8 9 discretion. But by and large, if you go through the jurors 10 and strike those that you are concerned about, you have to 11 make your own calculations as to how many strikes you want to 12 save. 13 MR. KAUFMAN: Oh, so, Your Honor, then I would be 14 able to save some peremptories? My concern is that --15 THE COURT: You would still have your peremptories as to any jurors that he's not passed on. 16 17 MR. KAUFMAN: I understand. 18 MR. FORRESTER: Ten and one, right, Your Honor? 19 peremptories and then the alternate? 20 THE COURT: There's one for the two alternates. MR. FORRESTER: Oh, okay. Two alternates. 21 THE COURT: Ten for the defense and six for the 22 government. 23 24 MR. FORRESTER: Okay.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

25

(Brief recess at 10:12 a.m. Defendant not present.)

THE COURT: Okay. Are the parties ready to begin?

We can bring in the jury.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. FORRESTER: Your Honor, the defendant is not here, sir.

THE COURT: You're quite right. Thank you. (Pause.)

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, there is one issue and we can wait until the defendant arrives if Your Honor prefers.

Has to do with a technological issue with the two recordings that we intend to present.

(Defendant entered the courtroom.)

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, I'll note for the record that Mr. Saldana has returned to the courtroom.

The one technological issue we're having, Your Honor, is that our trial laptop which has the Sanctions software so that we can have the streaming transcript of these two recordings -- and I just should note these are, from our perspective, the key pieces of evidence in the case. Murphy's Law, Your Honor. The Sanctions system is on the trial laptop and we're having a hardware problem. It seems that the part of the laptop that would connect into the court's sound system is broken. It's not a driver issue or something that can be fixed technologically here. We'd have to have a whole new

laptop.

I've spoken with the defense about this, and what we're proposing to try is -- I'll have to work on this over the lunch break, but we're hoping to use the visible portion of Sanctions on the trial laptop to show the streaming transcript using a second laptop which I just happened to bring with me that has the sound audio and then hit play on both at the same time so that it will work as if it ordinarily would work.

In the meantime, I've asked a colleague of mine to make photocopies, 14 copies. And actually, I'll have to make more for the court and for counsel as well even though it's been provided to counsel in discovery, but make additional copies so that as a backup, they'll have the hard copy to review along with the sound which they'll be able to hear. That's the backup plan.

I've discussed with counsel that because it's in English, it would not be, other than a demonstrative aid for the jury, not an actual exhibit so therefore they would only be allowed to review the transcript while listening to the audio. It would not be an exhibit that would go back to them to be reviewed independently. So I think that the parties are in agreement with that procedure.

MR. CANALES: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.

1 Okay. May we have the jury, please. 2 (Jury selection.) TUESDAY AFTERNOON, FEBRUARY 4, 2014 3 4 (Court resumed at 1:50 p.m.) 5 THE COURT: Are the parties ready to resume 6 business? 7 MR. FORRESTER: Defense is ready. 8 MR. CANALES: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: May we have the jury, please. 10 (Jury entered the courtroom.) THE COURT: All right. Members of the jury, the 11 court will first ask that the clerk impanel the jury. 12 13 (All 14 jurors were duly impaneled.) THE COURT: Thank you, Madam Clerk. 14 Now, the object, of course, is to conduct a fair and 15 impartial trial resulting in a fair and impartial verdict. 16 17 to that I'll give you a little bit of a road map by way of 18 jury instructions that will guide you in your participation in the trial. 19 20 It will be your duty to find from the evidence what the facts are. You and you alone are the judges of the facts. 21 You will then apply to the facts that you find from the 22 evidence the law that the court gives to you. The court 23 24 refers to the presiding judge. You must follow the law whether you agree with it or not and that, of course, ensures

that we all abide by the same law.

Nothing that the court may say or do during the course of the trial is intended to indicate or should be taken by you as indicating what your verdict should be. The evidence from which you will find the facts consists of the witnesses who are sworn and testify in front of you and also the documents and other things received into the record as exhibits and any facts that the lawyers agree to or stipulate to or that the court may instruct you to find.

Certain things, on the other hand, are not evidence and must not be considered by you in arriving at your verdict. The statements, the arguments and the questions by the lawyers are not evidence, so you have to make a distinction in your mind between what is said from the witness stand which is evidence and that which is said by counsel which is not.

The objections to questions are not evidence.

Lawyers have an obligation to their respective clients to make objection when they think something being offered in evidence may be improper under the rules of evidence. You should not be affected by the objection or by the court's ruling on it.

If you are instructed that some item of evidence is to be received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction.

Testimony that the court excludes or tells you to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered.

Anything you may have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide the case solely on the basis of the evidence presented to you here in the courtroom.

There are two kinds of evidence, it is sometimes said: Direct and circumstantial. Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact such as testimony of an eye witness.

Circumstantial evidence is proof of facts from which you may infer or conclude that other facts exist. I'll give you other instructions on these as well as other matters toward the end of the case. Keep in mind you may consider both types of evidence on an equal footing.

It will be up to you to decide which witnesses to believe or which not to believe or how much of any witness's testimony to accept or reject. I'll give you other guidelines for determining the credibility of witnesses toward the end of the case.

Now, as I indicated earlier, this is a criminal case and there are three basic rules about it which it won't hurt to go over once more.

First, the defendant is presumed innocent until proven guilty. The indictment brought by the government against him is only an accusation, nothing more. It is not proof of guilt or anything else. Defendant therefore starts out with a clean slate.

Secondly, the burden of proof is on the government throughout the case. The defendant has no burden to prove his innocence or to present any evidence or to testify. And since the defendant has that right, the law prohibits you from arriving at your verdict by considering that he may not have testified.

Third, the government must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt before there could be a conviction. I'll give you other instructions on this point later, but keep in mind that in this respect a criminal case is different than a civil case where there is a different standard of proof.

Now, a few words about your conduct as jurors. You as jurors must decide this case based solely on the evidence presented here within the four walls of this courtroom. This means that during the trial you must not conduct any independent research about the case or anything involved in the case, the individuals or institutions about which you may hear during the case. In other words, you would not consult dictionaries or reference materials, search the internet, websites, blogs or use any other electronic tools whatsoever to obtain information about this case or to help you decide this case.

Please do not try to find out information from any source outside the confines of this courtroom.

Until you retire to deliberate, you may not discuss this case with anyone, even your fellow jurors. If someone should ask you about the case at home overnight, you would tell them that you have been instructed by the judge not to discuss it until it's over. When it is over, you may discuss it all you wish. That will be entirely up to you at that time. So you cannot discuss the case with anyone until you have returned a verdict and the case is at an end.

Now, you may think I'm going over this too much, but the fact of the matter is if somebody violates one of these rules, the trial may have to be done all over again at wasted expense and difficulty for everybody concerned. So I'll go over it with you.

Many of you use cell phones, BlackBerrys, the internet, and other tools of technology. You must also not talk to anyone at any time about this case or use these tools to communicate electronically with anyone about the case. This includes your family and friends. You may not communicate with anyone about the case on your cell phone, through email, BlackBerry, iPhone, text messaging or Twitter, or any blog or website, including Facebook, Google, Myspace, LinkedIn or YouTube. You may not use any similar technology of social media even if I haven't mentioned it. I expect you will inform me as soon as you become aware of anyone's violation of these instructions. A juror who violates these

instructions jeopardizes the fairness of these proceedings and a mistrial could result which could require the entire trial process to start over.

And finally, do not form any opinion until all the evidence is in. So you must keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case. Then you make up your minds in deliberation with your fellow jurors.

Obviously, we can't have all the testimony come in in the twinkling of an eye. It has to come in witness by witness and so on, so keep an open mind about it until it's over. That's just common sense.

Now, if you do take notes during the trial, you may do that. Keep in mind it may be difficult to take detailed notes and pay attention to what the witnesses are saying at the same time. Sometimes observing how the witnesses testify is just as important in determining their credibility as it is important to know what they are saying. So if you do take notes, be sure that your note taking does not interfere with your listening to and considering all of the evidence.

Also, do not -- that is, if you do take notes, you would not discuss them with anyone before you begin your deliberations. Do not take your notes with you at the end of the day. You would leave them either there at your seat where you're sitting now or the jury room. They'll be secure either way.

And if you choose not to take notes, remember, it's your own individual responsibility to listen carefully to the evidence. You can't give that responsibility to someone who may be taking notes. We depend on the judgment of all the members of the jury and you must all remember the evidence in the case as it comes in.

Now, the order of trial will be as follows:

First, the government will have an opportunity to make an opening statement which would be simply an outline to help you understand the evidence as it comes in.

Next, the defense attorney may, but he does not have to, make an opening statement at this time or he may reserve an opening statement until later. Opening statements are neither evidence nor arguments. As I said, they're just sort of a road map to show you where they -- the attorneys think the evidence may go.

The government would then present its witnesses and counsel for the defendant may cross examine them. Following the government's case, the defendant may, if he wishes, present witnesses whom the government may cross examine.

And after all the evidence is in, the attorneys would present their closing arguments to you to summarize and interpret the evidence for you, and the court would then instruct you on the law. And then you would retire to deliberate on your verdict.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Will the government have an opening statement?

MR. KAUFMAN: We do, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may begin.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

May it please the court, counsel:

Ladies and gentlemen, the defendant, Martin Martinez Saldana, was a major methamphetamine trafficker. You're going to hear that he was responsible for well in excess of 500 grams of methamphetamine. And in fact, that's what's charged in the indictment. You're going to hear that the amount is multiple times that amount. And more than that, you're going to hear that it's more than just what we call a mixture and substance containing some amount of methamphetamine. That, in fact, most of the methamphetamine that he sold was either near pure or pure methamphetamine.

You'll be hearing from Special Agent Dustin Harmon and he'll talk about how methamphetamine is distributed, how it's packaged, how it's cut, if you will, or stepped on. The purity level is modified to extend it so you can sell more product. But he'll go into a discussion of the business and of the drug trafficking.

But ladies and gentlemen, one of the key things that you're going to be hearing in this trial is statements that the defendant himself has made. You're going to hear the

words coming out of his own mouth during two different conversations with different people involved in this conspiracy. And I might add, you're going to be hearing from those two people as well, and they're going to be testifying under oath about their involvement in the conspiracy with the defendant.

Now, how do we get here? Law enforcement had Mr. Saldana on their radar screen for a couple of years. They didn't get the break through until late 2012. What you're going to hear is that law enforcement was purchasing methamphetamine from a man named Danny Eller. Mr. Eller was selling to law enforcement through an informant, another informant.

And what happened is on October 26, 2012, they searched Mr. Eller's home. They found firearms. They found methamphetamine. And he immediately agreed to cooperate with law enforcement against Mr. Saldana in whatever law enforcement needed in order to stop further crimes by anybody involved in methamphetamine trafficking.

So what he did, you'll hear this recording. The first of the two recordings that I mentioned was on December 11th of 2012. Now, remember, this is over a month after he was, in fact, stopped by law enforcement. They went into his home and all of that. Not surprising, word got out. Word got back to Mr. Saldana. So when Mr. Eller went to meet

with Mr. Saldana, he kept asking him, Now, tell me about this arrest. What, oh, it was your neighbor? Are you sure? Who? What happened? He wanted more details. Why is that? Because he kind of knew what was going on.

In fact, you're going to hear that he was selling to Mr. Eller through another individual named Jose Pina, and Mr. Pina had stopped basically returning the calls. Everyone kind of knew the jig was up when it came to Danny Eller, that he was not somebody who could be trusted because as would be imagined, if he got stopped, then he might be working for law enforcement at that point. But you can tell that he was very concerned about it, repeatedly asking questions about this arrest.

Now, that's December 11th. I'm about to go to December 12th. Let's go back a little bit before that.

You'll hear that law enforcement was also buying methamphetamine from Bobby Shore. He, too, will take the oath and swear to tell the truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth and testify in this case.

And you're going to hear that on December 12th, so the day after Danny Eller tried to get that recording and tried to purchase narcotics from Mr. Saldana. Obviously he was burned. You're going to hear that Mr. Shore's house was searched based on a federal search warrant and they found -- what did they find? More methamphetamine. Purity levels

again consistent. High, high levels of methamphetamine.

Agent Harmon will be able to explain what that kind of means to you in terms of the source of the drugs.

But anyway, what did Mr. Shore do? He agreed immediately to cooperate with law enforcement against Mr. Saldana. And what did he do then? That very same day, December 12th, he agreed to wear a recording device just like Mr. Eller had the day before and go and meet with Mr. Saldana.

By the way, in terms of the timing here, you're going to hear that starting the summer of 2012 Mr. Saldana had left Mr. Pina as basically his subordinate to help do the drug transactions on his behalf because Mr. Saldana was going back and forth to visit family in Mexico. So he's back.

And then the December 11th conversation with Mr. Eller and Mr. Saldana happened. And then the next day Mr. Shore's stopped and he agrees to cooperate and he goes to Mr. Saldana's home and he has the recording. And that recording, ladies and gentlemen, corroborates everything because what does Mr. Saldana do? He keeps asking Mr. Shore, This guy, Danny, Danny, you know, the guy with the blue truck, I don't know, I think that he got busted.

And you'll hear Mr. Shore thinking on his toes. And he goes, Oh, yeah, yeah, I heard that too -- even though I'm an informant. But he says, I heard that too. He's dirty.

Mr. Saldana says, You know what, I don't trust him.

I don't trust anybody but you, Bobby Shore. I'm only going to sell methamphetamine to you. So you contact my guy Jose Pina and he'll sell to you.

Okay. And that's something you'll hear that a drug trafficker does often to shield themselves, to avoid detection, they sell through another person. And that's exactly what he was doing and you can tell that from the conversation.

In fact, one very interesting quote from near the end of the conversation because he's so concerned about Danny Eller and other people who are being arrested because there is a wave of arrests happening, Mr. Saldana tells Mr. Shore--

MR. FORRESTER: Object to the evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. KAUFMAN: -- I'm afraid they might squeal. They might tell on me.

What's there to tell unless you've got consciousness of guilt, ladies and gentlemen?

Now, so that's what happened with Mr. Shore.

You're going to be hearing from law enforcement officers. You're going to be hearing from Agent Harmon and from ATF, Agent Schauble. And the two of them actually -- I may be getting ahead of myself for a moment. So after the Bobby Shore conversation, law enforcement, in fact, arrested the defendant. They also searched his residence. After that

lawful search, what did they find?

Well, there were no drugs found in the residence. There were, however, four firearms found. They were found in the defendant's bedroom. And one of them was between the mattress and box springs, a handgun. And then there were two other handguns in the dresser drawer and there was also a short-barrel sawed-off shotgun in there as well. There was a set of drawers like a filing cabinet. And in the top one there were — there was a 12 gauge shotgun shell which matched that sawed-off shotgun that was in the dresser. And on top of the dresser, actually, there were three rounds of .22 caliber ammunition which fit all three of the handguns found in his room. The guns didn't have the bullets in them at the moment. At that very moment they didn't, but there was ammunition for all of the weapons there.

And you'll hear from Agent Harmon. He'll testify to you about tools of the drug trafficking trade and explain the significance of the firearms. Although as we discussed during voir dire, your knowledge and ways of the world will come into play during your deliberations as well.

So during that arrest of Mr. Saldana on December 12th, Agent Harmon and Agent Schauble did, in fact, interview the defendant and during that interview, he admitted that all four of those firearms were his.

You're going to be hearing some stipulations about

all the drugs seized throughout this investigation, and that they are, in fact, methamphetamine. That they've been lab tested and that their purity level, you'll be hearing, was at or near a hundred percent purity.

You're also going to be hearing from Detective

Jeremy Williams from the Ashe County Sheriff's Office. And
he'll testify about the use of Mr. Eller and of Mr. Shore,
he'll talk about the searches at Mr. Saldana's residence.

And interestingly, you'll also hear from Mr. Jose Pina himself who was working for Mr. Saldana, the one that Mr. Saldana had working for him while he was in Mexico.

All of the cooperating defendants, they have pled guilty. They've taken responsibility for their actions. And they're going to be testifying under oath to describe what happened. In fact, Mr. Pina at one point after he had gotten on board and was cooperating with law enforcement after his arrest, he even told law enforcement about money and drugs that the defendant had hidden on the property while he was away. And based on his information, law enforcement was able to seize \$50,000 that was hidden in kind of PVC piping dug down and hidden in the earth on Mr. Saldana's property as well as ounces of this high purity methamphetamine.

So after listening to the testimony of these witnesses, seeing the photographs from searches and, very importantly, listening to Mr. Saldana's own words when he met

with Mr. Danny Eller and when he met with Mr. Bobby Shore, we'll be concluding and asking you to return a verdict as charged.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Will the defendant have an opening statement at this time?

MR. FORRESTER: We do, Your Honor.

Good afternoon again, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Denzil Forrester. Along with co-counsel, Rick Canales, we're officers of the court. Our duty is to help in the administration of justice.

Today we have the privilege of representing
Mr. Martin Martinez Saldana. The government has accused
Mr. Saldana of taking part in a drug trafficking case,
specifically methamphetamine. They've also accused
Mr. Saldana of being in possession of a sawed-off shotgun, and
also being in possession of another weapon in furtherance of
drug trafficking. They have to prove that beyond a reasonable
doubt. It's almost like crime 101. You have a crime, a
perpetrator, and a victim. Or there's CSI, Law and Order.

But in this matter, the victim is not necessarily -that's steady. We know the government is the victim. They
make the laws. If they're broken, they're victimized.

However, the concentration is going to come from the witness stand concerning who the perpetrator is. And we know

who the alleged perpetrator is. And it's also going to come in concerning was there a crime?

So that's why it's important to pay attention, to watch them. And when I say pay attention, watch them, watch the testimony from the witness stand.

It's important because you have to watch them because the government has already advised you that they're going to use basically informants. They're going to use people who have done or admitted that they've done wrong in the past.

And you have to watch them because you want to see who's saying Mr. Saldana committed some sort of crime? You have to watch them because it's important to understand on what side were they, on whose side were they on at the time of the alleged crime and whose side they're on now.

You have to watch them because it's important to find out why. Why would they change their story? You have to watch them. It's important.

You have to watch them because it's important the testimony they're going to bring forth, whether they have an expectation to gain anything from it. You have to watch them.

You have to watch the law enforcement officers who take the stand and testify. It's important to pay attention to it.

It's important to pay attention to whether the terms

they use such as hoarding money, such as possession of weapons, you have to watch them to see if those form the basis, those general statements form the basis of any crime.

You have to watch the law enforcement officers to see if they perceive Mr. Saldana in any sort of hand-to-hand transaction. You have to watch them. You have to pay attention to the evidence even from the prosecution. Because the evidence is going to show you that basically charges were filed and charges were dismissed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Objection.

MR. FORRESTER: You have to watch --

MR. KAUFMAN: Objection.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. FORRESTER: You have to watch them. The superseding bill of indictment gets to be exposed in this case so you have to watch that.

You have to understand that in the government's case, they're going to parade a whole bunch of people who have done bad acts in the past. And now because they're all of a sudden friendly with the government, they're going to testify and want you to believe their story.

This is why I'm glad we have a fair jury system because it's your job to check and test the credibility of the government's case. People watch it. It's going to be a story -- it's going to be like a fancy commercial, full of

bells and whistles. It always is.

But at the end of it, I'll be back to argue concerning any evidence that's been presented.

Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, may we have a brief sidebar?

THE COURT: Yes.

Excuse us, please, members of the jury. You may be at ease.

(Sidebar conference as follows:)

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, in the defense's opening statement, they made reference to the bill of indictment and the superseding bill of indictment; and as the court has instructed the jury, that is not evidence. They are just merely charges. And now the defense seems to be trying to inject that as evidence, the indictment, the legal process; and I would move for the court to preclude any sort of evidence, if we can call it evidence, but presentation to the jury regarding any kind of charges that may have been dismissed by the United States. It's not evidence of innocence or guilt on the remaining charges against the defendant.

THE COURT: Right. So let me ask the defense what, if anything, you might be attempting to pursue in that regard?

MR. FORRESTER: We're not trying to pursue anything,

Your Honor. As -- in most criminal federal matters, the jury gets to take a look at basically the charging document. And my point is just to draw attention -- for them to pay attention to it because the fact is in my closing I can argue whether the government has a sound case, whether they equivocated on anything. I certainly can argue the government's case, the government's strength of their case. And that is one of many different parcels or one component of that.

THE COURT: Well, obviously you can argue whether the government has met its burden of proof on the present indictment on which we are proceeding.

MR. FORRESTER: Yes.

THE COURT: But as far as any previous indictment before the current superseding indictment or any charges that were dismissed, I don't believe that's relevant unless you can show me a good reason why it might be.

MR. FORRESTER: I think any evidence tending to prove or disprove -- and here's the thing, at least my argument. Okay. In a superseding bill of indictment where you have gun charges that were dismissed and then you have remaining gun charges, certainly I can argue that basically the soundness of the government's case hinges on that. So certainly it's relevant concerning you have at least one gun charge, then you have other charges -- gun charges that were

dismissed.

In my closing I can argue basically this is a case where the government already said there aren't going to be any trace evidence. There aren't going to be any -- if I can -- the government basically told the jury in its introduction to them there's not going to be any DNA evidence, and I think any -- there's three things they mentioned. And certainly I can argue concerning the strength or lack thereof of the government's case and concerning their equivocation on certainly the charging documents.

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to grant the government's motion to limit inquiry or other presentation by the defense concerning charges that are not going forward in the current indictment.

MR. FORRESTER: Okay.

THE COURT: I think to do otherwise would be unduly confusing to the jury. It wouldn't have any probative value. And it would complicate matters greatly for a jury trying to decide if the government has met its burden of proof on the charges on which it is going forward. That's always a government prerogative to dismiss charges on its own accord if it sees fit to do that. As a matter of fact, if we got into other charges that aren't even going to this jury, I'm sure your client would be complaining bitterly about that on appeal if he happened to be convicted, contending that matters

totally outside the indicted charges were brought up and that 1 that was the basis on which he was convicted. 2 MR. FORRESTER: And to be clear, Your Honor, in my 3 4 closing am I precluded from addressing the actual charging 5 documents and any -- yes, no, maybe so? 6 THE COURT: The charging documents on which we're 7 going forward? 8 MR. FORRESTER: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Obviously -- the jury will have a copy 10 of the indictment with it in the jury room. 11 Now, I would bring up the one matter that has to do 12 with the second charge of using and carrying and possession in 13 furtherance. As you said earlier in this matter, you're not pursuing the using and carrying prong of that statute. 14 15 MR. KAUFMAN: That's correct, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: So it would seem to me appropriate to 17 delete it from the language -- that language about using and 18 carrying from the indictment as surplusage. 19 Would you be objecting to that? 20 (Defense counsel conferred.) 21 MR. FORRESTER: No, Your Honor. 22

THE COURT: Okay. I mean, that's what normally happens in these cases. And since that -- there's not going to be any contention about using and carrying, at least the government is not going to argue that, let the evidence be

23

24

1 what it is on the question of further -- possession in 2 furtherance or not. 3 MR. CANALES: I'm sorry, Judge. 4 THE COURT: Yes, sir. 5 MR. CANALES: So the language is going to read in 6 possession of, in furtherance of. 7 THE COURT: Yeah, possession in furtherance of. 8 That language will be in there. 9 MR. CANALES: Possession in furtherance of. 10 THE COURT: Right. The using and carrying language will come out. 11 MR. FORRESTER: There's two prongs. 12 MR. CANALES: Okay. 13 14 THE COURT: Ms. Goodrich can show you. 15 MR. CANALES: I got it, Judge. I understand you. 16 MR. KAUFMAN: And with Mr. Forrester's reapproach on 17 what he can and can't do, so that all the parties are clear on 18 this, he's not to mention the dismissed 922(g) charges; is 19 that correct, Your Honor? 20 THE COURT: Right. 21 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. (End of side-bar conference.) 23 24 THE COURT: The government may call its first

25

witness.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

The United States calls Special Agent Dustin Harmon.

And I'll just note for the record, Your Honor, we will be asking the he be subject to recall later in the trial.

THE COURT: All right.

DUSTIN HARMON, GOVERNMENT WITNESS, SWORN,

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KAUFMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Please state your full name and introduce yourself to the jury.
- 11 A. Dustin Harmon, special agent with the Drug Enforcement 12 Administration.
 - Q. Can you tell the jury about your background in law enforcement.
 - A. Yes, sir, I sure could.

Probably -- trying to think back -- 1997, 1998 I was a deputy sheriff up in Virginia. After that I went to work as a police officer also in Virginia.

Then moved on to the DEA, to the Drug Enforcement

Administration, where I practiced -- or my post was in

Virginia for a while. I was then transferred to South America

and to the Bogota, Columbia area, and I did almost four years

in Columbia and South America, different parts.

And then I just recently within the last two years moved back up to God's country in North Carolina.

- 1 Q. Do you recall what month you came back to North Carolina?
- 2 A. April 2012, if I'm not mistaken. April/May time frame of
- 3 2012.
- 4 Q. Now, to the extent you can discuss this in open court,
- 5 can you tell the jurors what you were doing in Columbia and
- 6 South America.
- 7 A. Yes, sir. I was at -- there was a small specialized
- 8 group, narco-terrorism group in Bogota, Columbia, based out of
- 9 the United States embassy. We were assigned the task of
- 10 investigating narco-terrorism throughout South America and to
- 11 different parts of the world. And I was a member of that
- 12 group for, again, almost four years.
- 13 Q. And I believe that you stated you've been in law
- 14 enforcement for a little bit over 16 years, 17 years; is that
- 15 right?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. How many of those years have involved drug investigations
- 18 and arrests?
- 19 A. In some form or fashion, all those years have involved
- 20 some type of drug arrests or investigations.
- 21 Q. And can you give a rough estimate as to how many involved
- 22 methamphetamine?
- 23 A. Hundreds.
- 24 Q. Have you received any sort of specialized training that
- 25 | relates in some way to methamphetamine?

A. Yes, sir, I have. I received specialized training, but I've also received general training of methamphetamine and general drugs throughout my basic academies that I attended, continuing education classes that I was able to attend and some are required. I did take some advance classes on methamphetamine at Quantico, Virginia, at the FBI academy and DEA academy. I've received numerous hours of training on methamphetamine specifically.

- Q. Can you tell the jury what kinds of methamphetamine there are if there are more than one.
- A. Sure. In general, meth comes in different forms. There is the pharmaceutical form, obviously, that -- Desoxyn, I think it's called.

But there are illicit forms that come out that involve the manufacturing of methamphetamine, and this is the prevalent form that we see in the United States that's manufactured in Mexico and imported into the United States.

There's also a domestic type of Mexican -- of methamphetamine that's manufactured here in the United States.

They're all similar in the fact that they're methamphetamine, their base component is methamphetamine.

Some are similar in -- but differ in appearance. Some are crystalized rock, ice looking methamphetamine. Higher purity.

More clear. And some of the domestic methamphetamine that you'll see is more of a powdery, off-white chunk substance.

So there's a variance of the nature of methamphetamine, but the effect is a stimulant in methamphetamine.

- Q. If methamphetamine can be manufactured domestically, based on your training and experience, why is methamphetamine imported from Mexico?
- 6 Why is it imported? It's -- the larger quantities are 7 imported from Mexico. Very rarely do you have the 8 capabilities or find laboratories that are equipped to produce 9 the large sum of methamphetamine that's pumped out of Mexico. 10 In DEA it's classified as a super lab. I think the official definition is a laboratory that produces more than 10 pounds 11 12 in a 24-hour period. You just don't find those type of labs, 13 although there have been seized labs of this size in the United States, just not very common, especially on the east 14 15 coast. Therefore, the prevailing methamphetamine distribution comes from Mexico, importation thereof. 16
- 17 Q. Are you familiar with the term "shake and bake"?
- 18 A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir, I am.

3

4

5

- 19 Q. In this context, what does that mean?
- 20 A. It's a little watered down version of making
- 21 methamphetamine. Unfortunately, I was in South America when
- 22 it rose to popularity, but I did receive some training on it.
- 23 And it's a lot easier one-step method to making
- 24 methamphetamine. You can -- it's all circumstantial as far as
- 25 the time that it takes to make methamphetamine. But, you

know, a few guys can get together and put some precursor chemicals, and generally those precursor chemicals involve the diverted product of pseudoephedrine. Pseudoephedrine is used in making methamphetamine, especially domestically. They'll condense a lot of the steps to get to a final product of methamphetamine with a shake and bake method.

It's essentially in a bottle and they'll shake it up with diversionary products and the product is methamphetamine. But again, those yield smaller amounts of methamphetamine compared to a larger amount that you will get from Mexico.

- Q. Is there a general comparison of purity or quality level that you can make between, say, shake and bake and a Mexican lab or super lab?
- A. Domestic methamphetamine, depending on the cook -- and again, it's circumstantial -- it can be a higher purity. I found personally that the higher purity comes from Mexico. You will find some cooks domestically that can reach a higher purity. But in general, they're not quite as pure because of the machinery, the equipment, and the diversionary products that they use, the chemicals, the precursors, and they have specific labs set up for that in other parts of the world too, including Mexico.
- Q. Are you familiar with the acronyms either CI or CS?
- 24 A. Yes, sir, I am.

25 Q. What do those stand for in your opinion?

- A. We refer to a CI as a confidential informant or a confidential source. These are people that provide information through various means to law enforcement, specifically to us in DEA that we utilize to help us do our job. We utilize information from various facets to include sources of information and informants and sometimes cooperating defendants.
- Q. Can you give a rough estimate as to how many CI's, CS's that you've debriefed with or had informational meetings with?
- 10 A. Yes, sir. Again, it's a lot. A high number. I would have to say hundreds.
- Q. And based on debriefings with them, based on your training, your experience, have you come to be familiar with issues related to methamphetamine such as dosage units, pricing, packaging?,
- 16 A. Yes, sir, I have.
- Q. Can you start off with -- let's talk about an end user, the consumer. What is the amount or general amount or range that is considered a dosage unit?
- A. Okay. Again, forgive me for the generalizations, but it's circumstantial again because the user may be a veteran user, for lack of a better term, and he may have a higher tolerance that he may need to try to reach a higher or richer high. So I can't paint a broad stroke and say a dosage unit is A, B or C. But I can tell you they range from, like, a

tenth of a gram. Tenth of a gram would cost about \$10 if you want to get into pricing. I can kind of just brief while we go.

Q. Whatever makes sense to you.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

23

24

25

A. And you would evolve up into maybe a gram, which is about a hundred dollars in general, hundred dollars a gram.

Now, having said this, this can happen throughout the day. Once a day, two or three times a day a user may use this type of drug and this quantity.

So again, it's -- forgive me for not being able to pinpoint exactly what a dosage amount would be, but it would be somewhere in that range of a tenth of a gram up to a gram and several times throughout that day depending on their tolerance.

- Q. You started to talk about pricing for those dosage units.
- 16 How does the pricing for methamphetamine change, if at all,
- 17 **|** from those small dosage units to larger trafficking amounts?
- 18 A. It does change and you can almost insert your own
- 19 | favorite business model because it is -- it's generally a
- 20 business in the fact that you have a wholesaler, a larger
- 21 distributor, down to a retailer or reseller, down to a user.

So as we are familiar with from a Costco or a Walmart type scenario, the wholesaler may sell this product, in this case a pound of methamphetamine, for a general price of 16, 20 thousand dollars. A retailer or another distributor may buy

that for \$16,000, turn around and sell it at a gram level.

And since they're incurring more fees or more risks, they

would generally bump up the price of a gram, of an ounce, of a

pound if they resell it. Because what you'll find is from the

wholesaler it's a lot cheaper just like it is in anything that

we do daily and -- because we're selling them in large

quantities. The wholesalers are pushing them out to the

distributors in larger quantities so they can turn -- and you

may pick a pound of methamphetamine up, 5 pounds of

methamphetamine up on the border for \$2,000 and turn around

and sell it for \$20,000 in the mountains of Virginia or North

Carolina.

So the wholesaler will take that, push it out to a retailer. The retailer will perhaps gram it out and if he sold a typical pound, he bought it for \$20,000 and perhaps he wants to sell this \$20,000 pound in gram amounts at a hundred dollars a gram, because there are 28 grams in an ounce, will take that \$2,800 for an ounce that he just sold, 16 ounces into a pound -- and math wasn't my strong suit, but it's somewhere north of 40 -- \$44,000.

So again, it's a general business model.

Q. Agent Harmon, you were throwing out some weight amounts. You mentioned an ounce. Just in case others are similarly challenged as I am with regard to weights, how many grams are in an ounce?

- 1 A. 28 grams in an ounce.
- 2 Q. You also talked about pounds, but there are also
- 3 kilograms. How many pounds are in 1 kilogram?
- 4 A. 2.2 pounds in 1 kilogram, yes, sir.
- 5 Q. So is it accurate to say that if you are talking about
- 6 2.2 pounds, that was the equivalent of a thousand grams?
- 7 A. Yes, sir.
- 8 Q. Okay. Let's see. In terms of -- in discussing some
- 9 weights, are you familiar with the term "cut"?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. What is that?
- 12 A. I sure am.
- In this world of drug trafficking, oftentimes the
- 14 distributor, the next level from the wholesaler may want to
- 15 expand his profit margin. In doing that they will generally
- 16 take methamphetamine, a pound of methamphetamine, for
- 17 instance, let's just stick with the same example. They'll
- 18 | take that pound of methamphetamine and add an adulterant or a
- 19 cutting agent. On the streets they call it walking on it or
- 20 stepping on it.
- 21 It's simply adding an adulterant, a filler to spread out
- 22 your product, to spread out. So I may take that 1 pound that
- 23 we bought for \$20,000 and I'll take that pound and turn it
- 24 into a pound and a half or 2 pounds if I'm going to sell it.
- 25 A nasty product.

But essentially, you're just increasing your profit margin. So they'll cut it to increase their profit margin -- increase the weight of the drug and just take the life of their product and expand it a little bit.

And it's a general -- it's a general cutting agent of MSM, vitamins, lactose, baking soda. It's simple things that look -- and sometimes what's important with methamphetamine is that it has the same boiling temperature that methamphetamine would have. So if they burn it, it's not -- you know, you won't see the adulterant sitting still in the pipe or on their aluminum foil or whatever it is they want to use or to inhale or smoke or inject. It's got to have a similar chemical makeup so they use that similarly with methamphetamine, something that's very akin to meth's boiling point and a regeneration temperature when it comes back together.

- Q. Have you found there are certain methods used for packaging methamphetamine for distribution, and, if so, why?

 A. I have. Generally speaking it's -- a good foundation of
- meth or a foundation of methamphetamine packaging is plastic wrap or baggies.

Now, some people will go a step further and include something that may mitigate the smell of meth or the adulterants that are in the meth and they'll wrap it with something, maybe tape or put something in there, coffee grounds or dryer sheets, something that will mitigate in their

minds the smell that it emits for a possible canine detection. And this is explained through numerous interviews of why they would add something like a dryer sheet or coffee grounds or mustard seeds or something like that to divert any kind of olfactory detection.

- Q. With regard to distribution, are you familiar with the term "mule"?
- A. Yes, sir.

example would be.

- Q. Can you describe to the jury what that's about.
- A. I sure can. Again, going back to the example of taking that pound of methamphetamine from Mexico. In general, this distributor here locally is not going to take the risk or incur the risk of transporting the drug himself. So what he does is use a lower level member in the drug trafficking organization to do that for him or someone else disassociated to do that for him, a partner to do that for him. And sometimes they'll use a lower level member, a mule or a courier to say, hey, here's \$5,000. Go pick said pound of methamphetamine up from whatever part on the U.S. border and bring it back to me, or 5 of them, 10 pounds, however the

But in general, a courier is somebody a little bit further removed from the top echelon of a drug trafficking organization. For obvious reasons, to insulate himself from the actual risk of driving 2,300 miles to pick up a pound of

- 1 methamphetamine.
- 2 Q. Is such a courier used only on that wholesale level or
- 3 have you found in your training and experience they also can
- 4 be used on a lower level?
- 5 A. It trickles down. It sure does. It comes from the top
- 6 all the way down, and depending on how intricate the
- 7 organization will be as to how many different moving parts a
- 8 drug trafficking organization has.
- 9 And people that may have an ounce -- that may be ounce
- 10 dealers, which are just regular dealers in areas such as the
- 11 Western District of North Carolina, Virginia, they use
- 12 couriers also. So it's not for the elite or the upper
- 13 echelon, top of the food chain, DTO members.
- 14 Q. Are you familiar in this context with the term "stash"?
- 15 A. Yes, sir, I am.
- 16 Q. Can you describe what that means and why it's used.
- 17 A. Sure. Stash is a description or a word that we use or
- 18 | the community and drug trafficking organizations use for the
- 19 same aforementioned reasons that I'm going to use a courier.
- 20 If I'm a drug dealer, I'm going to use a courier to transport
- 21 said drugs. I will also use a different location to store
- 22 those drugs. I won't want to take the drugs and leave them
- 23 out on my bedroom table or in a nightstand. If I can, I'm
- 24 going to stash them somewhere, and that may be somewhere like
- 25 \parallel a void in a wall or a hole in the ceiling or a hole in the

floor, ceiling. In the ground is very, very common. Outside digging holes in the ground. These are various ways that drug trafficking organization members utilize to hide their product for obvious reasons, again, like I said before, to kind of insulate themselves from the actual product.

- Q. Have you heard the expression "tools of the drug trafficking trade"?
- A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Can you describe what that means to you.
- A. Just like any other business or any other job that we would have, there's tools of the trade. In drug distribution, tools of the trade would be things such as cell phones and guns. I think that it's very common for drug trafficking organizations, drug trafficking distributors, members to utilize phones. Sometimes more than one phone. Sometimes it's -- they'll utilize guns. And sometimes more than one gun.

And they do this for obvious reasons, and maybe obvious to me and maybe not so obvious to someone else, but they're utilizing phones to talk to other members of the drug trafficking organizations. Sometimes they'll take those phones and put them in other people's names. This is very, very typical. Matter of fact, it's atypical if it's done another way. But they'll usually put it in another name and, again, insulate themselves. Kind of like we were explaining

on the courier and the stash location, they'll insulate themselves by putting it in different names. I've seen them put it in various names, mothers' names, brothers' names, kin, partners.

My point is they'll put it in different names. They'll take those funds -- phones, excuse me, and communicate with other members: Drivers, retailers, resellers, sources. And some phones they'll utilize for one or two things and nothing else. The same thing with guns. They'll utilize guns to protect themselves, to protect their stash.

MR. CANALES: Your Honor, I'm going to object to the narrative. I mean, it's going on and on and on, Judge. I ask that it be a question and answer.

THE COURT: Well, overruled. But I would ask counsel to control that a little more.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor. I believe we're nearing the end of this portion of his testimony.

- Q. So Agent Harmon, with regard to firearms, again, I think you earlier said it may be self-evident, but can you explain how guns can be characterized as tools of the drug trafficking trade.
- A. Yes, sir. They're used to protect themselves, to protect stash locations, to protect themselves from law enforcement in many cases. They're essentially a tool of the trade in the fact that it's a tool for protection.

- 1 Q. Are you familiar with the term Santa Muerte?
- 2 A. Yes, sir, I am.
- 3 Q. Can you tell the jury what that means to you.
- 4 A. Santa Muerte. I received training on Santa Muerte. It's
- 5 an idle. It's a small statue sometimes. It's a folk saint to
- 6 some that is worshiped by drug trafficking members, drug
- 7 trafficking organizations. Although, it is also followed by
- 8 law-abiding citizens, it's very commonly found in drug stash
- 9 houses, drug couriers, drug transportation organizations.
- 10 It's a very common deity in the criminal drug trafficking
- 11 organization.
- 12 Q. And is Santa Muerte always something that's sinister?
- 13 A. No, sir. Again, I'll say it again. It is also followed
- 14 by law-abiding citizens.
- 15 Q. Let me turn your attention, you said that -- to the
- 16 investigation itself. I believe you said that you had arrived
- 17 in North Carolina DEA in April of 2012?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Do you see in the room Martin Martinez Saldana?
- 20 A. I do.
- 21 Q. Can you tell us where he's sitting and what he's wearing.
- 22 A. He's sitting between Mr. Canales and Mr. Forrester. He's
- 23 wearing a plaid type shirt, button up, with a white T-shirt
- 24 underneath it with the headphones on.
- MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, may the record reflect an

in-court identification of the defendant.

THE COURT: It will so reflect.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.

- Q. Agent Harmon, when did Mr. Saldana kind of get on to your radar screen as a target of any of your investigations?
- A. Shortly after I arrived in the Western District of North

Carolina, as I explained earlier, I received a phone call from

- 8 both law enforcement officials in Virginia and law enforcement
- 9 officials up in Ashe County, North Carolina. Based on
- 10 intelligence we received, we opened a case on Mr. Martinez
- 11 Saldana in the Western District of North Carolina out of my
- 12 office.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- 13 Q. All right. I'd like to show you some photographs that
- 14 have been marked for identification purposes as 1A through G.
- 15 I'm going to scroll through them. 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, 1F, 1G.
- 16 Do you recognize these images?
- 17 Oh, I'm sorry.
- 18 A. I didn't quite get it there.
- 19 Q. My apologies. Let me...
- Okay. Now everybody but the jury and the gallery. 1A,
- 21 | 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, 1F, and 1G.
- 22 A. Yes, sir, I sure do.
- 23 Q. And how do you recognize these individuals?
- 24 A. These are also people who we investigated during this
- 25 investigation with Mr. Saldana, the defendant.

- 1 Co-conspirators.
- 2 MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, at this time we would move
- 3 to admit and publish 1A through 1G.
- 4 THE COURT: Let them be --
- 5 MR. CANALES: No objection, Your Honor.
- 6 THE COURT: Let them be admitted.
- 7 (Government's Exhibits Nos. 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, 1F,
- 8 and 1G were received into evidence.)
- 9 0. All right. 1A, who is this?
- 10 A. Mr. Danny Eller.
- 11 Q. And have you had an opportunity to meet with him in the
- 12 | past?
- 13 A. Yes, sir, I have.
- 14 Q. 1B?
- 15 A. Bob Shore.
- 16 Q. 1C?
- 17 A. Jose Pina.
- 18 O. 1D?
- 19 A. Humberto Pina.
- 20 Q. 1E?
- 21 A. James Hawkins.
- 22 Q. And you mentioned this for 1A, but for 1D through E, have
- 23 you had an opportunity to meet with all these individuals?
- 24 A. Yes, sir, I sure have.
- 25 Q. And have you, in fact, debriefed with them about

- 1 Mr. Saldana and others?
- 2 A. Yes, sir, I sure have.
- 3 Q. 1F?
- 4 A. Mr. Martinez Saldana.
- 5 0. And 1G?
- 6 A. Ms. Clara Caudell.
- Q. And you've had an opportunity to meet with her, without going into any details --
- 9 A. Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 10 Q. -- about Mr. Saldana and others?
- 11 A. Yes, sir, I did.
 - MR. KAUFMAN: And, Your Honor, I have what's been marked as Government's Exhibit 14B for identification. We plan to leave it as an item for identification only for Agent Harmon. We're proposing to admit it and publish it at a later time in the trial.
 - THE COURT: All right.
- 18 MR. KAUFMAN: Images of it have been provided to
 19 defense counsel in discovery.
- 20 And, Your Honor, throughout the trial may I approach the witnesses on the stand?
- 22 THE COURT: Yes, sir.
- Q. Again, Agent Harmon, I'm showing you what's been marked for identification purposes 14B. It's not to be shown to the jury at this point in time. But if you could review it and

- see if you recognize the images. There are two tokens and then there is a bag that has something inside of it as well.
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. And if you could -- without going into any other detail, do you recognize images in that container, 14B?
- 6 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 7 0. And what are they?
- 8 A. In the bag or more specifically in general?
 9 The two small tokens?
- 10 Q. Yes.
- 11 A. I recognize them to be small idols of Santa Muerte.
- 12 Q. All right. And inside of the bag -- I'm sorry, you've
- 13 already stated this. What's inside of that?
- 14 A. It's another picture of Santa Muerte.
- 15 Q. All right.
- 16 A. With small tokens and a cross.
- 17 Q. All right. Agent Harmon, next I'd like to show you what
- 18 | have been marked -- one disk has Exhibits 7 and 8 and then
- 19 there's another disk with 7A, 8A, and then two documents, 7B
- 20 and 8B.
- Do you recognize all these documents -- these disks and documents?
- 23 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 24 Q. Can you tell us how you recognize them.
- 25 A. 7B and 8B are transcripts from previous recordings that

- 1 we had made with confidential sources, cooperating defendants.
- 2 And these are the applicable compact disks applying to each
- 3 transcript that was taken from those recordings.
- 4 Q. And so 7 and 8, are they the full recordings?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. And then are 7A and 8A clips that are --
- 7 A. Clips.
- 8 0. -- accurate clips of those recordings?
- 9 A. They're accurate clips of what's included on 7A.
- 10 Q. And then have you personally gone over these recordings
- 11 and the clips and confirmed that the transcripts in 7 -- 7B
- 12 and 8B are accurate?
- 13 A. Yes, sir, I have.
- 14 Q. All right. Now, did you also recognize the voices in
- 15 those two recordings?
- 16 **A**. I did.
- 17 Q. And with regard to the 7 series, who are the voices that
- 18 you recognized from that?
- 19 A. I recognized Danny Eller and Martin Saldana, the
- 20 defendant.
- 21 Q. And then in 8, the 8 series.
- 22 A. I recognized Bobby Shore and Martin Martinez Saldana, the
- 23 defendant.
- 24 Q. Okay. We'll get back into details in a moment, but did
- 25 you have the opportunity to, in fact, speak with Mr. Saldana

- 1 during the course of your investigation?
- 2 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- $3 \parallel Q$. Okay. And by the way, the disks that have 7, 7A, 8, and
- 4 8A, did you recognize your initials on those recordings?
- 5 A. I sure did, yes, sir.
- 6 Q. All right. Let's go to the date that you had the
- 7 conversation with Mr. Saldana. Let's turn to December 12,
- 8 2012.
- 9 Can you please tell us what happened that day.
- 10 A. December 12th, 2012, we executed a search warrant,
- 11 | federal search warrant on the property of Bob Shore in Ashe
- 12 County, North Carolina.
- 13 Q. And what happened as a result of that?
- 14 A. As a result of that, we ended up applying for and
- 15 executing another search warrant at the property of 148 and
- 16 178 Ervin Houck Drive in Ashe County, North Carolina, the
- 17 defendant's property.
- 18 **|**Q. And is, in fact -- is Mr. Saldana, in fact, the owner of
- 19 those properties?
- 20 A. Yes, he is.
- 21 Q. Have you seen deeds for those two properties that show
- 22 him as the owner?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And are there also two adjacent or connecting properties
- 25 of 212 Ervin Houck and one that's identified as a PIN

- 1 | number --
- 2 A. Sure.
- 3 Q. -- 131, et cetera?
- 4 A. Yes, sir, I have.
- 5 Q. And are those also -- do those also belong to
- 6 Mr. Saldana?
- 7 A. Yes, sir.
- 8 0. All right. When you executed the search warrant at
- 9 Mr. Saldana's residence, what, if anything, did you find?
- 10 A. The search warrant at Saldana's or Shore's, I'm sorry?
- 11 Q. At Saldana's.
- 12 A. Saldana's. We found various guns and identifications,
- 13 cell phones specifically at the 148 residence, to include
- 14 Mr. Saldana in the residence.
- 15 Q. Did you find any cell phones on Mr. Saldana himself?
- 16 A. I did, yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Now, you said that you had an opportunity to interview
- 18 Mr. Saldana. Can you tell us about how that happened.
- 19 A. Yes, sir. Once we made entry into the house and secured
- 20 the location, I sat down with Mr. Saldana and advised
- 21 Mr. Saldana of his Miranda warnings via a small yellow DEA-13A
- 22 card that I keep on my person. It's actually sitting at my
- 23 desk. The card is utilized just to advise them of their
- 24 Miranda warnings. I did that with Mr. Saldana and we spoke
- 25 subsequent to that.

- 1 Q. And were you alone?
- 2 A. No, sir.
- 3 Q. Who was with you?
- 4 A. I had several different investigators. Myself, when I
- 5 spoke with Mr. Saldana was Special Agent David Schauble with
- 6 ATF, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.
- 7 | Q. All right. In what language did the interview take
- 8 place?
- 9 A. With Mr. Saldana?
- 10 Q. Yes.
- 11 A. In English.
- 12 Q. Can you tell us why.
- 13 A. Because he spoke perfectly good English in my opinion and
- 14 he actually preferred English when I asked for the option
- 15 | because I speak Spanish.
- 16 Q. I was going to ask about that. Can you tell us about
- 17 your Spanish speaking ability.
- 18 A. I like to think it's pretty decent, but, you know, I
- 19 don't know. I had training. I had five months of training
- 20 and I do speak fluent Spanish.
- 21 Q. And despite your humility, are you able to conduct
- 22 translations between English and Spanish?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. And in fact, do you routinely use that as an effective
- 25 **∥**part of your job?

A. Yes, sir.

1

- 2 Q. All right. During the interview did you address with
- 3 Mr. Saldana the firearms that were found in the residence?
- 4 A. Yes, we did.
- 5 Q. And can you tell us about that part of the conversation.
- A. Yes, sir. Mr. Saldana stated that there were firearms in his house. I think specifically myself and Agent Schauble
- This house. I chilin specifically myself and rigene schaaste
- 8 asked Mr. Saldana if there were firearms in the house and he
- 9 said that there were.
- 10 He explained to me and Mr. Schauble, ATF Agent Schauble,
- 11 Special Agent Schauble, that the firearms, two of them -- if
- 12 I'm not mistaken, two of them were given to him by Betty
- 13 Houck, a lady that he shared the residence with. A shotgun
- 14 and a .22 pistol were given to him. And two others he had won
- 15 at a punch board game sometime in his stay in the states here
- 16 or during -- I think it was won here domestically, I'm sorry,
- 17 as opposed to in Mexico because he was traveling back and
- 18 forth.
- 19 Q. And the four firearms that he discussed with you, are
- 20 those the same firearms that -- or at least consistent with
- 21 the same four firearms that you found in his bedroom?
- 22 A. Yes, sir, they were.
- 23 Q. With regard to Mr. Saldana's phones, can you tell us,
- 24 what do you do when you seize a phone from a target?
- 25 A. Sure. Immediately we'll look into the phone to make

sure -- especially -- depending on the situation, circumstantial situation. In this case we had information leading us to believe that other things were happening. It was a very fluid situation. That Mr. Saldana may be leaving the country. So we immediately look into phones to see if there's anything that we can do to salvage safely evidence that may get destroyed. And we did that with the phones that were seized off of Mr. Saldana.

- Q. And is that a legal standard operating procedure --
- 10 A. Yes, sir.

- 11 | 0. -- for law enforcement?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Now, is there any way in addition to reviewing -- just by looking at the phone, is there any other effort that you will often take with regard to preserving the evidence in a phone?
 - A. Yes, sir. We have a -- not to get too much into the weeds, we have a device that downloads the phone to -- essentially so we won't have to sit and poke through the phone because so many phones are different and I have a hard time with some of these smart phones. They're a lot smarter than I am. So we'll download a phone into an easy readable format.
 - Government's Exhibit 30 for identification. And for the time being, everybody except for the jury and the gallery can see it. And I'm going to increase a certain portion in the middle

All right. I'd like to show you what's been marked as

- 1 or just near the middle.
- This is a multi-page document. Are you familiar with
- 3 this?
- 4 A. Yes, sir, I am.
- 5 Q. Can you describe what Exhibit 30 for identification is.
- 6 A. This is the product of a device that we used to download
- 7 our cell phones. It essentially prints it out in a nice,
- 8 clean, readable, user-friendly format.
- 9 Q. And this particular one you recognize?
- 10 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 11 Q. And what is it?
- 12 A. This is the phone that I retrieved off Mr. Saldana's
- 13 person.
- 14 Q. And did he have only one phone?
- 15 A. No, he had two phones on his person.
- 16 Q. All right. So with regard to this one --
- MR. KAUFMAN: By the way, Your Honor, we'd move to
- 18 admit and publish Exhibit 30.
- 19 THE COURT: Let it be admitted.
- 20 (Government's Exhibit No. 30 was received into
- 21 | evidence.)
- 22 Q. All right. I'm increasing the size of the portion just
- 23 above -- two-thirds of the way up the page.
- 24 Are you familiar with the number that's now appearing on
- 25 \blacksquare the right side starting with 336?

- 1 A. Yes, sir, I am.
- 2 0. What is that?
- 3 A. That's the telephone number corresponding to this phone
- 4 that we seized.
- 5 0. From Mr. Saldana?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Did you -- we went through Exhibit 1A through G and you
- 8 recognized certain individuals in this investigation. Did you
- 9 | find any of those people's phones and phone numbers -- I'm
- 10 sorry, phone numbers in Mr. Saldana's phone?
- 11 A. I did. I found all of the aforementioned people through
- 12 those pictures. I found -- I'm sorry, the pictures that we
- 13 just showed. I found those people in his contact list.
- 14 Q. Okay. I'd like to go in Exhibit 30 to page 3. And I'm
- 15 going near the bottom of the page.
- 16 This number ending 3830 stated for Bob.
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. Do you know whose phone that was?
- 19 A. That was Bob Shore's. This is the phone that he had on
- 20 him when we arrested him that same day.
- 21 Q. Okay. Going to the next page, 4, at the very bottom.
- Do you recognize this one that indicates Danny and then
- 23 | 1808?
- 24 A. I do.
- 25 Q. Whose is that?

- 1 A. This is Danny Eller's and this is the phone that he had 2 on him when we arrested him also.
 - Q. And then two-thirds of the way down the page.

 States Clara, ending in 5562.
 - A. Yes, sir. There are actually two phone numbers for Clara that we had determined through the investigation. Both of those belong to Clara Caudell in Virginia.
 - Q. Going to the next page, 5, about halfway down.

It says Don Jose and Don Jose 2 with a couple of phone numbers. Do you recognize either of those?

- 11 A. I do. Those are Jose Pina in the previous pictures.
 12 These are cell phones that he has utilized. And he had the
- 13 phones also with him when we arrested him.
- Q. Okay. Going to page 8, near the top, second from the top.
 - States Jimmy Hawkins and ending 2714. And whose phone is that?
 - A. Mr. James Hawkins, the gentleman in the picture. And this is the phone that he had when officers of the State Bureau of Investigation talked to Mr. Hawkins.
 - Q. I didn't go through all the photos of people that you've already testified about, but in 1E that's James Hawkins --
- 23 A. Yes, sir.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 24 Q. -- whose phone was in Mr. Saldana's --
- 25 A. Contact list.

- Q. Now, did you also have an opportunity to review other data that was downloaded from the phone, that is, images?
- 3 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 4 Q. Can you describe what you found.
- 5 A. I found several images on the phone belonging to
- 6 Mr. Saldana, the phone that I retrieved off his person, to
- 7 | include -- and forgive me if it's not the right -- selfies, I
- 8 guess is the term they're using. A picture that he appeared
- 9 to be taking of himself in that cell phone I seized off his
- 10 person.
- 11 Q. And I'd like to show you what's been marked for
- 12 identification purposes as 30A, and the jury can't see it yet.
- 13 Page 1, page 2, page 3, page 4, page 5.
- 14 Do you recognize these images?
- 15 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 16 Q. How do you recognize them?
- 17 A. Those are the -- consistent with the images found on his
- 18 cell phone when we seized the cell phone from Mr. Saldana.
- 19 Q. Okay. Now --
- MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, we'd move to admit and
- 21 publish 30A.
- 22 THE COURT: Let it be admitted.
- MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 24 (Government's Exhibit No. 30A was received into
- 25 | evidence.)

- Q. Okay. I believe you mentioned selfies. Is that referring -- this is now page 5. I'll go backwards.
- 3 Five?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 | O. Four?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 0. Three?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. And two?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Now, on page 1, is this also from his cell phone?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Now, unfortunately, the electronic exhibit sticker is on
- 14 the bottom right. What I'd like to do is show a printout
- 15 version of the very same image.
- Okay. What's showing now on the ELMO, on the overhead
- 17 image capture, is this the same as page 1 of Exhibit 38 --
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. -- 30A?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Okay. Now, do you see the bottom right corner where the
- 22 | exhibit -- electronic exhibit sticker was just shown to you?
- 23 A. Yes, sir, I do.
- 24 Q. Do you know what's in the bottom right corner or what it
- 25 appears to be?

- 1 A. Appears to be a box of latex gloves, yes, sir.
- 2 Q. What's that belief based on if there is anything more
- 3 than just looking at this image?
- 4 A. The night we did the search warrant, we seized a box of
- 5 latex gloves from that actual position off that table.
- 6 Q. In that same building?
- 7 A. In that same vicinity, yes, sir. General area.
- 8 Q. And that's on Mr. Saldana's property?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Oh, and I apologize. I'm not sure if the jury actually
- 11 saw 30A so I'm going to go back and run through them very
- 12 quickly.
- So 30A, page 1. There's that exhibit sticker on the
- 14 bottom right.
- 15 And then page 2.
- 16 Page 3.
- 17 Page 4.
- 18 And page 5.
- Now, in addition to the physical phone, is it customary
- 20 when -- during your investigation to also obtain from the
- 21 actual phone company certified subscriber and other records?
- 22 A. Yes, sir, sure is.
- 23 Q. And is that done via subpoena?
- 24 A. Yes, sir, administrative subpoena.
- 25 Q. All right. Did you, in fact, obtain the subscriber

- 1 records for this phone?
- 2 A. I did.
- Q. Okay. And this is the phone where the last four are
- 4 1155?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. All right. I'd like to show you what's been marked as
- 7 Exhibit 31 for identification purposes for everyone but the
- 8 jury at this point. Do you recognize this? And I'll
- 9 highlight the top third.
- 10 A. Sure. Yes, sir, I do.
- 11 Q. What is that?
- 12 A. This is the returned product that Carolina Wireless or
- 13 their subsidiary Neustar returns to us via an administrative
- 14 subpoena to let us know who the phone is registered to or who
- 15 purchased the phone.
- 16 Q. All right.
- MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, at this time we'd move to
- 18 admit and publish Exhibit 31.
- 19 THE COURT: Let it be admitted.
- 20 (Government's Exhibit No. 31 was received into
- 21 evidence.)
- 22 Q. All right. I am going to highlight that top third
- 23 portion again.
- 24 And so when it says "Target details," the phone number
- 25 there, that is the phone that you seized off of Mr. Saldana?

- 1 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 2 0. The customer name?
- 3 A. Francisco Lopes.
- 4 Q. Do you know or have you heard of anybody in the
- 5 investigation with that name?
- 6 A. No, sir.
- 7 Q. With regard to the customer address, 1 South Street,
- 8 Jefferson, North Carolina 28640, are you familiar with that
- 9 address?
- 10 A. No, sir. We actually checked that address and did not
- 11 | find a valid address at 1 South Street, Jefferson, North
- 12 Carolina.
- 13 Q. So your testimony is that's actually a fake address?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And there are other numbers for other individuals as part
- 16 of the investigation that are on Exhibit 31; is that right?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 \blacksquare Q. Now, after the so-called takedown or mass arrests that
- 19 were taking place on December 12th, 2012, that time period,
- 20 did you have an opportunity to debrief with Jose Pina?
- 21 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 22 Q. And was one of those debriefings on February 12th of
- 23 2013?
- 24 A. Yes, sir, sure was.
- 25 Q. So basically, two months after the arrests took place.

A. Yes, sir.

1

7

8

- Q. What sort of information did he provide to you that
- 3 caused you to take further actions after leaving the jail?
- 4 I'm sorry. Let me take a step back.
- 5 Where did your debriefing with Mr. Pina take place?
- 6 A. Caldwell County Sheriff's Office.
 - Q. Okay. And basically, what did he tell you?
 - MR. CANALES: I'm going to object, Your Honor.
- 9 Hearsay.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 MR. CANALES: He's going to testify as to what
- 12 somebody else told him.
- 13 Q. And specifically with regard to what you did --
- 14 A. Based on information I received --
- 15 THE COURT: Wait just a minute.
- 16 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
- 17 (Pause.)
- 18 THE COURT: Go ahead.
- 19 MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
- 20 The intention here is to ask what he was told to
- 21 indicate what he then did. This is not for the proof of the
- 22 matter asserted. This has to do with subsequent search
- 23 activity.
- 24 THE COURT: All right. Overruled.
- 25 Q. And so, Agent Harmon, specifically, although you may have

discussed many topics with Mr. Pina, if you could focus in on just the information he provided to you that caused you to then conduct certain activities.

- A. He explained to us that there were stash locations around --
- MR. CANALES: I'm going to object, Your Honor.

 Again, I'm going to renew my objection. Now, if he's going to testify that based on the conversation that he had, he took certain actions, I can see that, Judge. But for him to testify as to what was said, that he's basically saying what somebody else told him, Judge, that's plain hearsay.
- THE COURT: Sustained. Don't consider the last answer, members of the jury.
- Q. (By Mr. Kaufman) So without saying what Mr. Pina specifically said to you --
- 16 A. Yes, sir.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

19

20

21

22

- Q. -- can you tell us after speaking with him, what did you do?
 - A. Based on an interview with Mr. Pina, we applied for and received two state search warrants for the properties of 148 and 147 and their curtilage -- 178, I'm sorry, and 148 Ervin Houck Road and their surrounding curtilage.
- Q. And, Agent Harmon, just to confirm, I believe that there's been testimony about four immediately adjacent properties.

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. And so did the search warrants also cause you to search
- 3 more than just 148 and 178 Ervin Houck?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. Okay.
- 6 A. It's just a simple small square of property that's kind
- 7 | of subdivided.
- 8 Q. And actually, while we're talking about that, let me show
- 9 you -- let's see. Sorry, I'm going the wrong way. Here we
- 10 go.
- 11 Let me show you briefly what's been marked for
- 12 dentification purposes as 19 for identification. Do you
- 13 recognize what this is?
- 14 A. I do.
- 15 0. What is it?
- 16 A. That's a satellite image of the property that we've been
- 17 discussing, 148 and 178 Ervin Houck Road.
- 18 Q. All right.
- MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, we'd move to admit and
- 20 publish 19.
- 21 MR. CANALES: No objection.
- 22 THE COURT: Let it be admitted.
- 23 (Government's Exhibit No. 19 was received into
- 24 evidence.)
- 25 Q. All right. Can you tell us what properties are indicated

- 1 on this image.
- 2 A. 148 and 178 and the two aforementioned properties, the
- 3 PIN number parcel and the other -- forgive me for not knowing
- 4 the address, Mr. Kaufman.
- 5 0. Is it 212?
- 6 A. 212 Ervin Houck Drive.
- 7 Q. Okay. Let's see.
- 8 And so you were starting to discuss how you obtained a
- 9 couple search warrants for these properties. Were you, in
- 10 | fact, present during the search?
- 11 A. Yes, sir, I was.
- 12 Q. Just in general terms, what, if anything, did you find?
- 13 A. We found approximately \$50,000 in United States
- 14 currency -- I believe it was 49,980, \$20 shy of 50,000 --
- 15 buried in the ground and several ounces of methamphetamine
- 16 buried in the ground or hidden in various places throughout
- 17 the property; some other stash locations, meaning some empty
- 18 PVC pipe tubes that were placed there consistent with that
- 19 which we found the \$50,000 in; and some ammunition and, if I'm
- 20 not mistaken, magazines for a long gun.
- 21 Q. All right. After the seizure of the money, did you
- 22 obtain a bank check for the money that you turned in?
- 23 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 24 Q. I'd like to show you what's been marked for
- 25 | identification purposes as Government's Exhibit 17.

1 Do you recognize what this is?

A. This is the cashier's check or the official check published receipt of the money that we turned over to Yadkin Valley Bank.

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, we'd move to admit and publish.

THE COURT: Let it be admitted.

(Government's Exhibit No. 17 was received into evidence.)

- Q. So this was for the funds that were seized as a result of your conversations with Mr. Pina from Mr. Saldana's property?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

- Q. Now, approximately a year later, now, February 6th of 2014, did you have a subsequent -- did you have a subsequent debrief with Mr. Pina?
- 16 A. Yes, sir, I did.
 - Q. And what additional information did you learn then?
- A. Based on information we provided -- based on information gained during an interview with Mr. Pina, we spoke with April -- I'm sorry, the name escapes me. A female friend of
- 21 Mr. Pina, and realized under -- and basically -- I'm trying to 22 be careful here, Your Honor, excuse me.
- Essentially, we -- based on the interview, we spoke with
 April Blevins, a friend of Mr. Pina's, and recovered a \$20,000
 pickup truck, and spoke with her and debriefed Mrs. Blevins

- 1 concerning her knowledge of the involvement of Mr. Saldana and 2 Mr. Pina.
 - Q. Did you come to learn where Ms. Blevins had obtained that money for the truck?
 - A. From the properties that we just saw up on the screen.
 - Q. And did you then -- what did you do with regard to that truck?
 - A. We seized it. Administratively seized the pickup truck.

9 MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, we have no further 10 questions.

11 THE COURT: Wait just a minute.

I beg your pardon.

3

4

5

6

7

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: We're going to take a recess.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor. And I will just note that we have no further questions for Agent Harmon at this time. When his testimony is over, we'd ask that he be subject to recall.

THE COURT: All right. That's suitable.

We'll take a recess, members of the jury. We'll call for you in about 15 minutes. Remember the usual instructions. Keep an open mind. Don't discuss the case. Thank you.

(Brief recess at 3:20 p.m.)

25 THE COURT: Are the parties ready to proceed?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Your Honor.

2 MR. CANALES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: May we have the jury, please.

(Jury entered the courtroom.)

THE COURT: All right, sir. The jury is settled.

Cross examination.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. CANALES: Yes, Your Honor, if I may.

DUSTIN HARMON

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CANALES:

- 11 Q. Mr. Harmon, I'm going to be asking you some questions.
- 12 Sometimes I have a tendency to speak really fast. If I do,
- 13 please ask me to repeat the question. I'd be more than happy
- 14 to. You're not going to insult me. Just anything that -- the
- 15 way -- how I say words you don't understand them, let me know.
- 16 I'd be more than happy to repeat them time after time. Deal?
- 17 A. The same to you.
- 18 **Q.** Now, Officer, you said that you arrived -- did you arrive
- 19 here in North Carolina in April or May of 2012?
- 20 A. Yes, sir. In that time frame, yes, sir.
- 21 Q. So you were in -- and then this arrest happened when?
- 22 A. December 2012.
- 23 Q. December of 2012. Now, so it's -- and prior to that you
- 24 had been gone for years?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- 1 Q. Are you originally from here?
- 2 A. No, sir.
- 3 Q. Where are you from originally?
- 4 A. Virginia.
- 5 Q. Virginia. So would it be fair to say that your knowledge
- 6 of who's who in this county or in this area in April or May of
- 7 2012 was just as good as mine? Meaning you were new.
- 8 A. No, sir. And I can explain that if you would like.
- 9 Before I went to South America, Columbia, I was stationed in
- 10 the Roanoke, Virginia, DEA office.
- 11 Q. Yes, sir.
- 12 A. And their area of responsibility borders North Carolina's
- 13 area of responsibility. So the Western District of Virginia
- 14 is where I was working. It bordered the Western District of
- 15 North Carolina. Moreover, I actually did undercover work in
- 16 North Carolina, specifically in Ashe County, North Carolina,
- 17 against Mexican methamphetamine.
- 18 **Q.** Okay. But let me ask you this question, then. In April
- 19 and May of 2012 when you first got here, did you already know
- 20 about Mr. Eller?
- 21 A. Mr. Eller?
- 22 0. Yeah. Had you met him before prior to that date?
- 23 A. Prior to me arriving, no, sir.
- 24 Q. Have you ever -- prior to that date have you ever met
- 25 Hawkins?

- 1 A. No, sir.
- 2 0. What about Ms. Caudell? Clara.
- 3 A. Her specifically? No.
- 4 Q. Okay. How about the Pinas?
- 5 A. No, sir.
- 6 Q. Okay. So is it fair to say that the first time you even
- 7 heard of these people was in April or May of 2012?
- 8 A. Yes, sir, fair statement. Absolutely.
- 9 Q. And then by, say -- you testified that in February of --
- 10 in February of 2013, two months after the arrests, you're
- 11 already talking to Pina; is that correct?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. As a matter of fact, you testified you spoke to one of
- 14 the Pinas, but in reality you had a chance to speak to both of
- 15 them; is that correct?
- 16 **A**. I did.
- 17 Q. Okay. So you had been here, like, say, ten months, eight
- 18 months when you were relying on the Pinas; is that fair to
- 19 say?
- 20 A. No, sir.
- 21 Q. You got here in April, May of 2012. You spoke to them on
- 22 or about February 2013, right? How long -- you had been here
- 23 how long?
- 24 A. Your time frame is right, but your statement of me just
- 25 relying strictly on the Pinas I don't agree with.

- 1 Q. No, of course. Of course. There's different -- you
- 2 testified also earlier that you got your information from --
- 3 in different ways.
- 4 ∥A. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. Okay. That's a fair statement?
- 6 A. Maybe I misunderstood the question, I apologize.
- 7 Q. Now, is Jose Pina an honest person?
- 8 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection.
- 9 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 10 A. He is -- he was eventually an honest person, yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Eventually?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. How about Humberto Pina?
- 14 A. He was also eventually an honest person, yes, sir.
- 15 Q. And Bobby Shore?
- 16 A. He was an honest person to my knowledge, yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Was he an honest person always?
- 18 A. I'm sorry?
- 19 Q. Has he always been an honest person?
- 20 A. From the times that I've talked to him, Mr. Canales, I
- 21 can say that he corroborated a lot of my investigation, yes,
- 22 sir.
- 23 Q. Do you think he was a good and honest person in October
- 24 of 2012?
- 25 A. October of 2012?

- 1 Q. Uh-huh.
- 2 A. I didn't know Mr. -- Mr. Shore, is that who we're talking
- 3 about? I didn't know Mr. Shore in October 2012.
- 4 0. How about --
- 5 A. Personally.
- 6 Q. How about Mr. Hawkins in, say, November 2012, a month
- 7 prior to the arrest of my client, was he a good person?
- 8 A. I didn't have a chance to talk to Mr. Hawkins in November
- 9 of 2012, I apologize.
- 10 Q. Okay. Now, do you think they're honest now?
- 11 A. Yeah, they are now, yes, sir.
- 12 Q. And do you think they're reliable?
- 13 A. They are now, yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Do you know approximately the date in which Pina became
- 15 honest?
- 16 A. I couldn't specify the date, Mr. Canales, but I can tell
- 17 you that it's not a very uncommon occurrence for somebody to
- 18 | mitigate their role and eventually tell the truth.
- 19 Q. But right now we're talking about honesty.
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Which is something the jury is going to have to decide
- 22 whether people are being --
- 23 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 25 A. Undoubtedly, yes, sir.

- Q. Honesty is an issue that -- credibility is something that will be up to the jurors to decide --
- 3 A. Sure.
- 4 ■Q. -- of a person, right?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. All right. So do you think that Mr. -- let's talk about
- 7 Ms. Clara Caudell, Clara. Is she honest?
- 8 A. She was eventually honest with us, yes, sir.
- 9 Q. Okay. How about Mr. -- how about trustworthy? Is she
- 10 | trustworthy?
- 11 A. Eventually I can corroborate information. And that's
- 12 what I do for a living with confidential sources and
- 13 informants is I corroborate their information. That's when I
- 14 decide whether I should use them or not. And I decided to use
- 15 them.
- 16 Q. And I understand you make an honest evaluation --
- 17 A. Sure.
- 18 Q. -- and a fair evaluation of what's given to you and from
- 19 there you make a decision.
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. I'm not questioning that at all, Officer. What I am
- 22 | asking you is about a person's integrity: What's in their
- 23 heart, what's in their soul. Do you think that the Pinas --
- 24 the Pinas are good in their heart as far as honesty?
- MR. KAUFMAN: Objection, Your Honor. This testimony

- about what's in someone's soul and their heart, let's stick with the facts.
- THE COURT: Overruled. Cross examination.
- 4 Q. Okay. Now, let me put it this way. When was Hawkins
- 5 arrested?
- 6 A. Forgive me, Mr. Canales, I don't know the date. I can't
- 7 remember exact dates.
- 8 Q. Okay. When did Humberto Pina get arrested?
- 9 A. It was also December 12, 2012.
- 10 Q. December 12, 2012. Now --
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. -- what about Jose Pina?
- 13 A. It was the same day.
- 14 Q. How about Bobby Shore?
- 15 A. Yes, sir, same day.
- 16 Q. And Mr. Eller?
- 17 A. No. Now, if I'm not mistaken, it was the day before --
- 18 ∥no, I'm sorry, it was weeks before. It was weeks before the
- 19 12th.
- 20 Q. Bobby Shore or Mr. Eller?
- 21 A. Mr. Eller.
- 22 0. Weeks before?
- 23 A. If I'm not mistaken. And forgive me for not knowing the
- 24 dates.
- 25 Q. So in reality, you hadn't spoken to none of them prior to

- 1 the date of their arrest, correct?
- 2 A. Fair to say.
- Q. Okay. Now, is it fair to say that they have a reason for coming and testifying today, right?
 - A. I'm sorry?

5

- 6 Q. I mean, do they have a motive to testify today? What's
- 7 ☐ in it for them? They all have something in common, right?
- 8 A. Sure. And I'm sure their desire is to have a reduction
- 9 in their sentence by telling the truth to the judge.
- 10 Q. Wouldn't you -- would it be fair to say that criminals
- 11 would go out of their way, forego honesty just to get what
- 12 | they want?
- 13 A. The generalization could be that; understanding with
- 14 these particular individuals that if they do not tell the
- 15 truth, they're in worse harm, worse shape, and we've explained
- 16 that to them.
- 17 Q. Well, the truth is something the jury is going to decide.
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection, Your Honor, to this line of
- 20 questioning. It's not about facts as perceived by the
- 21 witness.
- 22 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 23 Q. Now, as a matter of fact, what they are going to come and
- 24 testify as to is what they previously have told authorities;
- 25 | is that correct?

- 1 A. They're going to testify to the truth, as I understand 2 it.
 - Q. Now, it's common knowledge in the jail that if you're there and you help prosecute a case, there's going to be a benefit for you as far as a sentence reduction, right?
 - A. I've never been in jail. I couldn't tell you that.
 - Q. No, I know that. But I know you've dealt with enough criminals in all your years of experience to know that those guys in jail know that if they cooperate, they're going to get something in return.
 - A. I can speak to what I've -- who I have spoke to specifically and explain to you how I talk to them about it.

 And I explain to them if they tell the truth, the only consideration they're going to get is from His Honor, from the courts.
 - Now, if they -- and conversely, Mr. Canales, if I -- I explain to them every time that if they do not tell the truth, there is a -- in fact, a punishment that they would receive for not telling the truth in federal court.
- 20 | Q. And I believe you say that.
- 21 A. I do.

Q. And I also believe that you believe that. However, I'm coming from a different angle. I'm coming from their angle, their motives. I mean, would you agree with me that there's a strong motivation for them to testify in court?

- A. There would be a motivation for them to testify in court provided they tell the truth. Because again, I explain to them if they don't tell the truth, then they're going down a different path. So the motivation would be to tell the truth
 - Q. All right. Then let me put it this way. When they provide substantial assistance is when they get their sentence reduced, right?
- 9 A. Yes.

in court.

5

6

7

8

18

19

20

- Q. Okay. And when they come and testify in court, to your knowledge and experience as an officer, is that considered substantial assistance?
- A. That's not for me to decide. It's always the discretion and the consideration of the court to provide a 5K or Rule 35 which is substantial assistance. I can only say if they will come testify honestly, the judge or the court will consider that testimony and hence dish out a Rule 35 or a 5K.
 - Q. Actually, Officer, it's not -- the one who decides to file a motion to reduce the sentence is the U.S. Attorney's Office, the prosecutor, right?
- 21 A. Again --
- Q. I can't move to file a motion to reduce a sentence, can
 T?
- 24 A. Nor can I.
- 25 Q. The one who moves to say, Hey, Judge, this sentence

- 1 should be reduced is the U.S. Attorney's Office, right?
- 2 A. The U.S. Attorney's Office.
 - Q. Meaning the prosecutor.
- 4 A. The prosecutor asks for the judge's --
- 5 Q. Right?

3

- 6 A. -- and court's consideration.
- 7 Q. And ultimately, the one who decides is the judge. But
- 8 the one who moves --
- 9 A. Is definitely not you and I.
- 10 Q. Yes, sir, that's for sure.
- Okay. Now, have you had a chance to look at the indictment that was --
- MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, we object. Your Honor's explained to the jury that the indictment isn't evidence in this case.
- 16 THE COURT: I'll wait for a question and then I'll consider an objection.
- Q. Are you familiar with the charges that my client is facing today?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. What are they?
- 22 A. Conspiracy, possession of a sawed-off shotgun, and a
- 23 924(c), which is a possession of a firearm in furtherance of a
- 24 drug trafficking crime.
- 25 Q. Conspiracy to what?

- 1 A. Import methamphetamine. Distribute methamphetamine.
- 2 Q. Okay. Now -- and what's the other charge?
- 3 A. Again, possession of a sawed-off shotgun.
- 4 | Q. Okay. Now, let's talk about that. Let's talk about --
- 5 now, are you sure -- are you sure that he's being charged with
- 6 importation of meth?
- 7 A. Distribution of methamphetamine.
- 8 Q. So not importation, right?
- 9 A. I'm not sure if it's importation or not, but I know it's
- 10 distribution of meth. It's a distribution charge.
- 11 Q. This is your case, right, Agent?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. You're the lead agent?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. I mean, as far as decisions to be made in this case,
- 16 evidence to be presented, it's based on your investigation and
- 17 | knowledge, right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Okay. So it's not importation. It's possession,
- 20 distribution?
- 21 A. Distribution.
- 22 0. All right.
- 23 A. Conspiracy to distribute, I think.
- 24 Q. Now, would it be fair to say that you're not -- you never
- 25 seen my client possess drugs?

- 1 A. Fair to say, yes, sir.
- 2 Q. Right. You never seen him touch meth or -- right?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 Q. You never seen any in his possession or sell it, right?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. Okay. As a matter of fact -- as a matter of fact, your
- 7 knowledge -- or most of your knowledge or some of your
- 8 knowledge comes from what's coming from the mouth of the
- 9 informants, right?
- 10 A. We have different faucets of the investigation, and
- 11 cooperating defendants, confidential sources, and confidential
- 12 informants are part of that, yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Whatever evidence there is in this case, most likely it's
- 14 going to be presented today, right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. So if a major chunk of that comes from the informants, I
- 17 mean, that will be up to the jury to decide, right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. So Francisco Pina, Sr. -- we'll call him Pina Sr.
- 20 because we have father and son, right?
- 21 A. Sure.
- 22 Q. Pina Sr., has he been sentenced?
- 23 A. Not to my knowledge, no, sir.
- 24 Q. Has he pled guilty?
- 25 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Let's talk about -- Francisco Jimenez Pina, is he known by other names?
- 3 A. I'm sorry?
- 4 Q. Pina Sr., is he known by different names?
- 5 A. Jose Pina, Francisco Pina, Jose Francisco maybe.
- 6 Q. Yeah, but do you know if he used aliases before to hide
- 7 his identity?
- 8 A. I apologize, I don't. I don't remember that.
- 9 Q. Okay. Now, is he -- is he an illegal alien in this
- 10 country? Meaning, did he break the immigration laws of the
- 11 United States of America?
- 12 A. I don't know his immigration status; but if I'm not
- 13 mistaken, he is illegally here in this country.
- 14 Q. Now, are you aware that my client, Mr. Saldana, is an
- 15 | American citizen?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Okay. Now, let's talk about Mr. Hawkins. Has he been
- 18 | convicted?
- 19 A. I don't think that he has been convicted. And he's not
- 20 part of this charge of this indictment.
- 21 Q. All right. Fair enough.
- 22 A. So apologies for not knowing the ins and outs of his case
- 23 as far as his current status whether he's been convicted or --
- 24 I apologize, I do not know the status of that.
- 25 Q. So better yet, Hawkins is not even -- not part of this

- group of people that's getting charged for this offense,
- 2 | right?
- 3 A. He's not been charged under this indictment.
- 4 Q. Okay. He's coming from -- now, has he been sentenced?
- 5 A. Again, I apologize for not knowing the ins and outs of
- 6 Mr. Hawkins' current status.
- 7 O. How about Clara?
- 8 A. Clara has been sentenced.
- 9 Q. Is she part of this conspiracy?
- 10 A. In this indictment? She's not on this indictment.
- 11 Q. Okay. Has she been sentenced?
- 12 A. Again, yes, sir, she has been sentenced.
- 13 Q. Now, if she has been sentenced, is there a benefit for
- 14 her to testify today? I mean, she's doing her time already,
- 15 right?
- 16 A. She is in federal prison at this time, yes, sir.
- 17 Q. All right. She's -- okay.
- Now, so is there incentive for her to testify today? Is
- 19 there something going to be given to her assuming she comes
- 20 and gives her version of the truth?
- 21 A. Just like the other five defendants -- witnesses that
- 22 will be here today, they can hope for the consideration of the
- 23 | court.
- 24 Q. Or better yet, hope for a motion to be filed for the
- 25 sentence to be reduced and granted by the court?

- 1 A. They can hope for consideration of the court.
- 2 Q. Now, were you the one that arrested my client?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 Q. Okay. Now, when drugs -- you said that drugs were
- 5 ultimately found after the search warrant?
- 6 A. In the investigation, yes.
- 7 Q. That was -- when you arrested my client, did you arrest
- 8 him with drugs?
- 9 A. No, sir.
- 10 Q. So as a matter of fact, the drugs that were found were
- 11 | found two months later; is that correct?
- 12 A. Some of the drugs that were found were found two months
- 13 later, yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Okay. Now, this money that you're talking about, this
- 15 49,000 plus that was found, this was also found two months
- 16 after my client was in jail; fair to say?
- 17 A. Fair to say, yes, sir.
- 18 **|** Q. So do you know -- do you know who put the drugs where
- 19 they were found?
- 20 A. I'm sorry, who put the drugs?
- 21 Q. Like in other words, yes, there were drugs that were
- 22 | found two months later, right?
- 23 A. Right.
- 24 Q. Now, do you know who's responsible for putting those
- 25 drugs there?

- 1 A. Based on my investigation?
- 2 Q. Yes, sir.
- 3 A. Mr. Jimenez Pina, Mr. Jose Pina, and Mr. Martin Saldana.
- 4 Q. Well, somebody was the one that put them there. Now,
- 5 | let's talk about this property.
- 6 A. Okay.
- 7 Q. Right? Right now we saw Exhibit Number -- an aerial
- 8 photograph.
- 9 A. 30A maybe?
- 10 Q. I believe it was Exhibit Number 19. The satellite view
- 11 of Saldana's residence and surrounding area. Do you remember
- 12 | that one?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Okay. Can you see it?
- 15 A. Yes, sir, I can.
- 16 Q. Same one over here?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. Can you elaborate on these properties?
- 19 A. Can I elaborate in what form or fashion? I can say that
- 20 they're on --
- 21 Q. Describe it.
- 22 A. It's a small house on the corner of Ervin Houck Drive,
- 23 221.
- 24 Q. I'm sorry, say it again.
- 25 A. It's a house.

- 1 Q. Where?
- 2 A. Right there (indicating).
- 3 Q. Which is the house of my client?
- 4 **|** A. Right there (indicating).
- 5 Q. Okay. I'm sorry, you're pointing to the blue dot.
- 6 Sorry.
- 7 And describe the property.
- 8 A. This is the driveway. This is the driveway leading in.
- 9 This whole property, my understanding, is Mr. Saldana's
- 10 property.
- 11 Q. Okay. Now, there's a trailer, right?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Where is the trailer?
- 14 A. (Witness indicated.)
- 15 Q. Okay. Who was residing in the trailer?
- 16 MR. KAUFMAN: And, Your Honor, just to protect the
- 17 record, there is now an arrow pointing towards the trailer.
- 18 And we'll be asking the court to take a photograph of that.
- 19 THE COURT: All right. I take it the jury can see
- 20 the blue markings on there?
- 21 THE JURY: (Affirmative nods.)
- 22 THE COURT: Thank you.
- 23 Q. Now, who lives -- who resided in that trailer?
- 24 A. Jose Pina.
- 25 Q. Huh?

- 1 A. Mr. Pina and his son -- or Pina Jr. and Sr., I think 2 that's what we agreed on.
- Q. Now, this information was given to you by Pina himself, the one you spoke to two months later, right?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Any reason why he didn't speak to you a week after his arrest?
- 8 A. Why he didn't?
- 9 0. Uh-huh.
- 10 A. I don't recall the circumstances of when he called or when his attorney contacted us and set up a proffer.
- 12 Q. Now --
- 13 A. But sometimes, as most of us know, the government moves
 14 kind of slow, and I don't recall.
- Q. I mean, did he -- did he in any way maybe use his honesty for the truth to talk to you the day of his arrest?
- 17 A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
- Q. In other words, this honesty that we're talking about him
- 19 to tell the truth, this honesty to -- this duty to come
- 20 forward, he didn't find -- he didn't find it on December the
- 21 12th, right? He didn't decide to talk to you until two months
- 22 | later, right?
- 23 A. Very common.
- 24 Q. Was there a deal made at that point?
- 25 A. No, sir.

- 1 Q. Has a deal been made since?
- 2 A. No, sir.
- 3 Q. I mean, he's already pled guilty, right?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. And you -- are you familiar with the terms of the
- 6 agreement?
- 7 A. No, sir.
- 8 Q. How about -- let me put it this way. Pina Jr. also pled
- 9 **∥** guilty, right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Are they looking at the same punishment or different
- 12 punishment?
- 13 A. I'm not sure, Mr. Canales. I apologize.
- 14 Q. Now, Officer, you know how it's important, right, to know
- 15 what a witness's possible incentive would be, right? I mean,
- 16 what they're pleading guilty to, whether they got a break and
- 17 what they pled to or -- strike that. Let me ask you this way.
- 18 In federal court, right, the amount, meaning less than
- 19 500 grams, more than 500 grams makes a huge difference as to
- 20 the type of punishment or range of punishment you ultimately
- 21 | could receive, right?
- 22 A. Fair enough, yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Right. Now, if a person gets a role adjustment, meaning
- 24 | if it's decided that he's a minor participant or minimal
- 25 participant, that's an even greater gift or benefit.

- 1 ▮ A. It's the law, yes, sir.
- 2 Q. Yeah. I mean, right?
- Now, do you know if Pina Jr. was given a role adjustment?
- 4 A. I do not know that.
- 5 0. You don't know that?
- 6 A. No, sir.
- 7 Q. Would you be surprised if I was to tell you that he got a
- 8 | four-level reduction?
- 9 A. No, sir.
- 10 Q. Or they're recommending that he get a four-level
- 11 | reduction?
- 12 A. No, sir.
- 13 Q. Okay. Would you be surprised if I told you that he's
- 14 pleading to less than 500 grams?
- 15 **A**. No, sir.
- 16 Q. Okay. All right.
- 17 Then let's talk about this property. You know that --
- 18 did you have a chance -- were any neighbors around?
- 19 A. I'm not sure of the neighbor situation at the time. I
- 20 know it shows some cars over here.
- 21 Q. Say that again, I'm sorry.
- 22 A. I'm not sure of the neighbor situation at the time that
- 23 we were on the property. It shows some cars over in this
- 24 area, this far area (indicating).
- 25 **Q**. I mean, to the right?

- 1 A. Yeah, over here to the right, yes, sir.
- 2 Q. I mean, there's neighbors there, right? Did you --
- 3 A. That would be south.
- 4 Q. Okay. Do you -- did you know how long the Pinas have
- 5 resided there?
- 6 A. I found out it was probably the summer of 2012.
- 7 Q. Okay. So the Pinas were new, right?
- 8 A. New to...
- 9 Q. To the area, there. To that house. They were renting,
- 10 | right?
- 11 A. They were renting, yes, sir.
- 12 Q. They told you, We are renting from defendant Saldana,
- 13 | right?
- 14 A. Mr. Saldana.
- 15 Q. They were paying rent.
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Okay. Now, did you -- did you investigate how many other
- 18 | families have resided in that exact trailer?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 Q. Well, wouldn't you think that's important, sir?
- 21 A. If I would I probably would have investigated it. I
- 22 didn't deem it relevant at that time.
- 23 Q. And there were other officers involved, right? Local
- 24 authorities, right?
- 25 A. There were local authorities involved, yes.

- 1 Q. Right? I believe we have Gene Parsons, right?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. He's more local to the area, right?
- 4 **∥**A. State police.
- Q. Now, did anyone find it relevant to investigate how many
- 6 people had lived in that trailer, how many people have rented
- 7 and how many times in the previous years?
- 8 A. They may have. I'm not privy to that knowledge, to that
- 9 information.
- 10 Q. Okay. Now, is it fair to say that whatever money was
- 11 | found, right, because you said that two months later you all
- 12 came back and searched, right? Two months later, whatever
- 13 money was found was found on the property behind the trailer
- 14 of the Pina brothers -- father and son.
- 15 A. It was near the Pina trailer, yes, sir.
- 16 Q. Can you point to how close.
- 17 A. In this general area. Somewhere under this tree
- 18 somewhere. We found several different things in this area.
- 19 But if I'm not mistaken, it was in that area (indicating).
- 20 Q. And the drugs?
- 21 A. We found drugs also in this area here. We also found
- 22 drugs up here (indicating).
- 23 Q. Okay.
- 24 A. And some stashes in this area (indicating).
- 25 Q. Okay.

- 1 A. Maybe on the side there, I should point out.
- 2 Q. Okay. Now --

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. KAUFMAN: And just for the record, the last areas that the witness testified to were the three dots below the arrows and then the witness testified about additional locations. It's the four dots higher up in the squarish area located on the image.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, and I apologize not knowing specifically as in those four dots, obviously I can't hold that to scale.

- Q. (By Mr. Canales) So it could be lower down? It could be lower down?
- 13 A. No, it's up around this outbuilding also.
- 14 Q. All right. Let me ask you this now. What was the --
- 15 now, these properties have different addresses; is that
- 16 | correct?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. As a matter of fact, what's the address for -- what's the
- 19 address for my client?
- 20 A. This area here, if I may circle this little area here, is
- 21 148 Ervin Houck Drive (indicating).
- 22 0. 148?
- 23 A. Sorry, it would actually be up around this area, I think,
- 24 | if I'm not mistaken (indicating).
- 25 \mathbb{Q} . But do you know that for a fact?

- 1 A. No, I don't.
- 2 Q. Okay. Then -- is it your testimony today that you have
- 3 personal knowledge that it includes the shed?
- 4 A. Which shed?
- 5 Q. The one to the right.
- 6 A. This one -- the last arrow I touched, that one
- 7 (indicating)?
- 8 Q. Are you a hundred percent correct?
- 9 A. I'm not a hundred percent sure about that.
- 10 | Q. Okay.
- 11 A. But I'm a hundred percent sure it's under Martin
- 12 | Saldana's name.
- 13 Q. Yes, we know that. But -- that he -- now also, the other
- 14 property, the trailer had a different address, right?
- 15 A. This trailer had a different address.
- 16 Q. What's the address?
- 17 A. 178 Ervin Houck.
- 18 **Q**. 178. And then also, there was another -- another -- the
- 19 other section across -- that's a different deed, different
- 20 property.
- 21 A. A little parcel, yes.
- 22 0. Which one?
- 23 A. In this area over here, if I'm not mistaken (indicating).
- 24 Q. Okay. So --
- 25 A. And it may go further up, I apologize. I don't know

- 1 the -- the zone.
- 2 Q. Officer, when people rent properties, landlords, when you
- 3 ∥rent a house, whether it be next to you or not, are you
- 4 allowed just to go into the trailer and do whatever you want
- 5 **∥** if you rented that property?
- 6 A. If you have an agreement with the person renting the
- 7 property, yes.
- 8 Q. But most of the time when a property is rented, that's
- 9 under the control of whoever is renting the property, am I
- 10 mistaken?
- 11 A. Whoever is renting the property?
- 12 Q. Yes, right?
- 13 A. The landlord can come in with their key and fix, change,
- 14 open, access, to my understanding. And again, I'm not a
- 15 police officer in North Carolina. I'm actually a special
- 16 agent, so I couldn't...
- 17 Q. Well, do we have any evidence to that effect that that
- 18 | happened in this case, that my client was there fixing
- 19 anything? We don't, right? There's nothing.
- 20 A. I don't have anything --
- 21 Q. Okay.
- 22 A. -- to say that he was fixing anything.
- 23 Q. All right. So as far as we know, it was the Pinas who
- 24 had control of 178.
- 25 A. The fact that he owned it and other evidence in the case

- 1 showed that he had a key and had access to 178.
- 2 Q. Okay, sir. That's an inference that can be made, right?
- A. I'm going off of the case, the facts of the case that I received.
- Q. The facts of the case are that -- correct me if I'm wrong, that the Pinas told you that they were renting their property. That they had been there since the summer of 2012,
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Right?
- And it's also undisputed that it was the Pinas who led you to the drugs and the money that was found on their side of the property, at least the money. All that was found there,
- 14 right?

8

15 A. The money but not the drugs.

and they were paying rent.

- 16 Q. Okay. But --
- 17 A. The stash locations.
- Q. The investigation, as a matter of fact -- there was money -- it was brought to your attention afterwards, right,
- 20 that somebody had been to the property and retrieved some of
- 21 the money, right?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. And you were told that it was Pina's girlfriend, right?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. And did she admit to it?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And that was prior to him finding it in his heart to be
- 3 truthful or afterwards?
- 4 A. Which part?
- 5 Q. Like in other words, did he first state I am going to
- 6 talk to the government; I am going to be honest? Or the first
- 7 thing he thought was let me tell my girlfriend where the money
- 8 is at? What happened first?
- 9 A. Let me tell the girlfriend where the money is at.
- 10 Q. Okay. And the girlfriend went for it, right? I mean --
- 11 and he was -- now, it's undisputed that my client did not --
- 12 strike that.
- 13 What did the girlfriend do with the money?
- 14 A. She purchased a pickup truck.
- 15 Q. Did you confiscate that truck?
- 16 **A**. I did.
- 17 Q. And what else did she do with the money?
- 18 A. She put \$15,000, supposedly, and this is her information,
- 19 on his lawyer's bill.
- 20 Q. Whose lawyer?
- 21 A. Mr. Pina's.
- 22 0. Pina Sr.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. So here we have Pina Sr. telling the girlfriend go get
- 25 \parallel the money, this is where it's at. And pick -- get a lawyer or

- 1 pay for a lawyer and buy a truck. And Pina knew about this,
- 2 right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. It didn't come to a surprise to him how the money was
- 5 spent, right?
- 6 A. Right. Right.
- 7 Q. Ms. Caudell, Clara, she's got a history of substance
- 8 abuse, right?
- 9 A. I don't recall her criminal history.
- 10 Q. No, no, no. Not -- well, other than her criminal history
- 11 because we do -- we agree she's got felony convictions, right?
- 12 A. I'm sorry?
- 13 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection.
- 14 THE WITNESS: I have no idea.
- 15 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 16 THE WITNESS: I have no idea.
- 17 Q. Now, I'm talking about drug usage, not convictions.
- 18 People can be using drugs all their life and never get busted.
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Excuse me, never get arrested, right?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 0. Okay. Does she have a lengthy history of substance
- 23 abuse?
- 24 A. She explained to me that she is a user of
- 25 methamphetamine.

- Q. All right. I mean, at one point that was her life,
- 2 right? I mean --
- 3 A. I don't know if it was her life. She didn't say that,
- 4 but she told me she used methamphetamine, yes, sir.
- 5 Q. To your knowledge and experience as an officer, was that
- 6 a substantial addiction? Was it like an addiction?
- 7 A. Yes, sir, she had an addiction to methamphetamine, yes.
- 8 0. She's a recovering addict, right?
- 9 A. Undoubtedly.
- 10 Q. A recovering addict that is in jail now.
- 11 Now, let's talk about Hawkins. Does Hawkins have a
- 12 history of drug usage as well?
- 13 A. I'm quite certain that he does. I don't recall it. I
- 14 don't recall how extensive or experimental. I couldn't tell
- 15 you.
- 16 Q. Now -- okay. Did you ever listen to the -- Bobby Shore
- 17 wore a wire, right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay. Meaning he was there in an attempt to get evidence
- 20 I for you all, right?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 jury, do you remember the substance of the recording?
- 24 A. Yes, sir. It's a lengthy recording, but I remember the
- 25 **∥**gist of it, yes, sir.

- Q. Do you remember the first words that were told to Bobby
 Shore prior to him going close to my client?
- 3 A. No, sir.
- 4 Q. Do you know who's the investigator -- Investigator
- 5 Williams?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 0. Who is that?
- 8 A. Ashe County Investigator Sergeant Williams with Ashe
- 9 County Sheriff's Office.
- 10 Q. Local guy -- local gentleman?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Okay. Do you remember him telling him, Look, don't
- 13 worry. Go for the truth. Go for honesty. Go for what's
- 14 right. Do you remember him saying that?
- 15 A. Not saying he didn't, Mr. Canales. I do not remember
- 16 that.
- 17 Q. Or do you remember him telling him, It's what we need;
- 18 lit's what we need?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 Q. Why would -- why would an office -- why
- 21 would an officer of the law tell that to a person wearing a
- 22 wire: This is what we need; this is what we need? Why would
- 23 that officer's first words out of his mouth be, This is what
- 24 we need; this is what we need? Do you understand why?
- 25 A. You mentioned that he asked for the truth. Didn't you

- 1 say he asked for the truth and this is what we need? It
- 2 evolved into this is what we need. I'm assuming that would be
- 3 it. I don't remember him saying that. Not that he didn't. I
- 4 | just couldn't answer that.
- 5 Q. If we have a recording of that conversation between Bobby
- 6 Shore and my client, right, that happened on December 12th,
- 7 which is the day that my client was arrested. I mean, what
- 8 the officer is telling this person wearing a wire, that's
- 9 important, right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir. And make no mistake, I'm not saying that he
- 11 didn't say that. I'm just telling you my honest recollection
- 12 is I do not remember that part of the recording.
- 13 Q. Fair enough. But -- do you know if my client is a drug
- 14 user?
- 15 A. I'm sorry?
- 16 Q. Do you know -- do you have any evidence whether or not my
- 17 client is a drug user?
- 18 **∥** A. I received information that he -- I received information
- 19 that he did drugs.
- 20 Q. Okay. Now, he -- he was local, right? My client is from
- 21 this area, right?
- 22 A. I'm not sure originally where he was born, but this is
- 23 where he's resided for several years.
- 24 Q. Let me ask you, do you have -- give me one second.
- 25 Were you aware that my client and his daughters -- were

- 1 you aware that my client has been residing at that address for
- 2 the last 28 years, he's been a member of this community?
- 3 A. I just heard him say that, but before that I didn't
- 4 realize that.
- 5 Q. Okay. Were you aware that his daughters were born here
- 6 in North Carolina?
- 7 A. No, sir.
- 8 Q. No? Okay. Were you aware -- do you know where he used
- 9 to work?
- 10 A. Adams Construction and maybe Vannoy Construction.
- 11 Q. Okay. Now, let me ask you this very important question.
- 12 I mean, did you know -- based on your investigation, was there
- 13 any financial need why my client would have to be even
- 14 involved in drug dealing?
- 15 A. He quit -- he quit work in 2011.
- 16 Q. He got arrested in 2012, right?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. Okay. So -- I mean, the economy hit everybody, right?
- 19 A. (Affirmative nod.)
- 20 Q. Now I'm asking you, but prior to that he had always been
- 21 working, right?
- 22 A. I'm sorry?
- 23 Q. Now prior to 2011 he had always been working.
- 24 A. I couldn't say. I just know that he did work for Adams
- 25 \blacksquare Construction and Vannoy Construction according to him, and we

- 1 have corroborative information that he was working at Adams
 2 Construction prior to 2011.
- Q. Now, this address, the one where he resides, he's been making mortgage payments for how long?
- 5 A. Not sure exactly. I don't recall.
- 6 Q. But do you know -- did you know the property is not paid for?
- 8 A. Is now paid for?
- 9 Q. Is it paid for?
- 10 A. I'm not sure. I can't remember exactly.
- 11 Q. I mean, this is something that would be relevant, right?
- 12 I mean, especially if they're going to go after the property.
- 13 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection. Argumentative.
- 14 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 15 **Q**. I mean, right?
- 16 A. Thank goodness in my case it's compartmentalized. In DEA
- 17 we have somebody that works on the asset forfeiture side of
- 18 | the house. So as far as like mortgage payments and the
- 19 amortization charts, I wouldn't handle that. And I apologize
- 20 for not knowing how many years he's paid for that.
- 21 Q. Were you aware that this property up until now is still
- 22 | not paid for?
- 23 A. No, sir.
- 24 Q. Were you aware that he's been for, I don't want to say
- 25 ∥decades, but for year after year after year he's been making

- 1 mortgage payments like everybody else?
- 2 A. I couldn't tell you one way or the other. I apologize 3 for not knowing that.
- Q. Were you aware that my client was making 48 to 50 thousand dollars a year in Adams Construction?
- 6 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection. Your Honor, may we have a 7 sidebar?
- 8 THE COURT: No, sir. Overruled.
- 9 Q. Officer, who made the call that December 12th, 2012, was
 10 the day to arrest my client? And I mean that in a good way.
- 11 I mean, it could have been made December 11th, December 13th
- 12 or 20th. I mean, who made the call to make the arrest on
- 13 December 12th?
- A. It was probably a conglomeration of several people, but I
- 15 probably made the final call.
- 16 Q. Okay. Now, who made the call on -- some cases are
- 17 more -- some criminal cases are more complicated than others,
- 18 **do you agree?**
- 19 A. Sure, absolutely.
- 20 Q. All right. In some criminal cases, I mean, there will be
- 21 recording after recording after recording for years, for
- 22 months. Would you agree with me?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. In some criminal cases there will be -- the phones will
- 25 be tapped, right?

- 1 A. Sure.
- 2 \parallel Q. Now, in this case was there a recording made of my
- 3 client's phone, his conversations?
- 4 **∥**A. Title III intercept?
- 5 | Q. Yes, sir.
- 6 A. No, sir.
- 7 Q. Now, you said that you found a couple of his phones,
- 8 right?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Okay. You said that there was at least two numbers,
- 11 | right?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Now, he's got at least two daughters, right?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. Young daughters, right?
- 16 A. Okay. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Okay. Now, was there a chance to get -- did you ever
- 18 decide to get a wiretap on those phones? Intercepts?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 Q. You made that call?
- 21 A. I did.
- 22 Q. Okay. Now, as far as the type of -- as far as the type
- 23 of people that would be used, what I mean type of people, I
- 24 mean -- yes, the type of people that would be used who make
- 25 \blacksquare the call, who would wear a wire and who wouldn't wear a wire?

- 1 A. Yeah, I can say I made the call. And I will clarify, I'm
- 2 not making the call to intercept his phone simply because time
- 3 | had ran out.
- 4 | Q. All right. Then --
- 5 A. So my goal was to go and do whatever we could to exploit
- 6 the information. But time had ran out and that's why I made
- 7 the call to make the arrest.
- 8 Q. Okay. The one in charge of this investigation is you.
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. If time runs out or doesn't run out, it was your call,
- 11 | right?
- 12 A. No. Unfortunately, we were forced -- our hand was forced
- 13 that day.
- 14 | Q. Okay.
- 15 A. He was going back to Mexico.
- 16 Q. Now, sir, you had information that he had been to Mexico
- 17 several times in the past.
- 18 A. Sure.
- 19 Q. I mean, him going to Mexico was not a new thing, right?
- 20 A. Yeah, under this case it was.
- 21 Q. Okay. Well --
- 22 A. Because he was on to law enforcement.
- 23 Q. He was what?
- 24 A. You'll hear that in the audios. He was on to law
- 25 enforcement. He was aware that law enforcement had made

- 1 recent arrests and he said that he was going back to Mexico.
- 2 So taking the culmination of the evidence, I made the call to
- 3 make the arrest because he's going back to Mexico at this
- 4 point in my mind for the reason of one thing, to escape
- 5 justice and go back to Mexico.
- 6 Q. And again, you're the one making the calls.
- 7 **A**. Sure.
- 8 0. You made that call. And also look at the area, look at
- 9 his neighborhood where he comes from. Is this considered
- 10 like -- I'm not familiar with North Carolina so this is my, I
- 11 don't know, fifth time in North Carolina maybe.
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. But this is -- this is considered the hills, right?
- 14 | Country?
- 15 A. Country, yes, sir. Absolutely beautiful.
- 16 Q. I mean, this is a small community, right, where he comes
- 17 from?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Bobby Shore, where is he from?
- 20 A. Ashe County. Same thing. Same kind of area.
- 21 Q. All right. How about Eller?
- 22 A. Same kind of area.
- 23 Q. I mean, don't you think that a community this small is
- 24 going to know who gets arrested, who doesn't get arrested? I
- 25 mean, this is bigger than Statesville, right?

- 1 A. What's bigger than Statesville?
- Q. This area -- I mean, Statesville is more populated than
- 3 where my client was residing for the last 20 years, right?
- 4 A. Per capita, yes, sir, I'd say you're right.
- 5 Q. I mean, because Statesville, it's a medium size town, but
- 6 people know what happens to other people, I mean, right?
- 7 **A**. Sure.
- 8 Q. In the community. Wouldn't you think --
- 9 A. That's part of the reason I think he wanted to leave so
- 10 fast.
- 11 Q. Wouldn't you think the same applies as to what happens to
- 12 people in Ashe County?
- 13 A. Yeah. Again, I think that's part of the reason that I
- 14 made the call to make the arrest.
- 15 Q. Okay. I mean, that would be news, right, somebody from
- 16 Ashe County getting arrested?
- 17 A. Coupled with the fact that he says, "I'm leaving to go
- 18 | back to Mexico tonight. I'm not going to tell anybody else.
- 19 Do not tell anybody else." That's why I made the decision to
- 20 end the investigation early.
- 21 Q. Okay. You made your call on the day of his arrest.
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Right?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. On...

- 1 A. December 12th, 2012.
- 2 0. December the 12th.
- 3 On December 12th did you search 1 -- did you search 148,
- 4 his home?
- 5 **■** A. Did I search it personally?
- 6 Q. Or did anybody?
- 7 A. No, somebody did, yes, sir.
- 8 0. And what was found there?
- 9 A. Four of Mr. Saldana's guns.
- 10 Q. Okay. Where were they?
- 11 A. In his bedroom. One under the mattress and then the rest
- 12 in his clothing drawer. Chest of drawers I think is what we
- 13 call it.
- 14 Q. And did you have -- was the shotgun found there?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. Okay. Did you have a chance to examine whether or not it
- 17 was working, operable?
- 18 A. I did not. I did not.
- 19 Q. Well, today, March, I don't know, the 4th, right?
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Months -- or a year and some time later --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- have you had a chance to examine whether or not the
- 24 shotgun was operable at the time?
- 25 A. I personally have not, no, sir.

- 1 Q. Now, this -- what caliber was this pistol?
- 2 A. I'm sorry?
- 3 Q. The handguns that you found, what caliber?
- 4 A. Caliber was a .22, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Canales.
- 5 Q. All three guns were .22s?
- 6 A. The shotgun was not a .22, but the three pistols -- or
- 7 pistols and revolvers were .22s, yes, sir.
- 8 Q. I call them handguns --
- 9 A. Handguns.
- 10 Q. -- versus a rifle or a shotgun.
- But they were caliber .22, right?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Now, those -- as far as the calibers in guns, .22 is the
- 14 smallest caliber you're going to find, right?
- 15 A. It is the smallest caliber, yes, sir.
- 16 Q. I'm a gun aficionado myself. I love guns.
- 17 A. Most concealable smallest caliber.
- 18 Q. But as far as calibers versus .45 versus .38 special
- 19 versus .357 magnum, you know --
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. -- that is the smallest caliber of weapon, right, of
- 22 handgun?
- 23 A. It is -- maybe there is a smaller, but it's one of the
- 24 smallest, yes.
- 25 Q. But to your knowledge, is there a smaller one?

- 1 A. Not that I'm aware of, but I just don't want to box 2 myself in saying there is.
- 3 Q. Based on your knowledge of the Ashe County area, would it
- 4 be uncommon for people to have a .22 or an old shotgun?
- 5 A. No, sir.
- 6 Q. It's something you expect to find in a lot of those homes
- 7 even that live in the country?
- 8 A. Absolutely, I agree.
- 9 Q. Especially people that lived there for 10, 15, 20 years.
- 10 A. Yes, sir, fair to say.
- 11 Q. Let me talk about the exhibit that you were describing
- 12 earlier about the Santa Muerte.
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Without getting into too much detail.
- Now, you're saying that's derived from being Catholic,
- 16 | right?
- 17 A. Did not say that.
- 18 Q. Okay. From what religion is Santa Muerte?
- 19 A. I'm sorry?
- 20 Q. From what religion is the Santa Muerte?
- 21 A. I think it's his own religion.
- 22 0. Are you a hundred percent sure?
- 23 A. My understanding based on my training it is
- 24 non-sanctioned.
- MR. CANALES: May I approach, Your Honor?

- 1 THE COURT: Beg your pardon?
- 2 MR. CANALES: May I approach to get an exhibit?
- THE COURT: You may approach.
- Q. If I may have the exhibit on Santa Muerte. Do you have
- 5 | it?
- 6 A. No, I don't have it.
- 7 MR. CANALES: Do you have it, the exhibit of Santa
- 8 Muerte?
- 9 Q. You've had a chance to see this, right, what's inside
- 10 here?
- 11 A. Yeah.
- 12 Q. Does it have a prayer on the back?
- 13 A. I'm not sure.
- 14 Q. I'm sorry, it's got an image and a prayer on the back,
- 15 | right?
- 16 A. I'm not sure if it's a prayer.
- 17 Q. Do you know what it is?
- 18 A. No.
- 19 Q. It's in Spanish, right?
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 21 It's a -- well, it looks like a prayer to Santa Muerte,
- 22 the saint of death.
- 23 Q. Fair enough. Now, South America does not go to --
- 24 Brownsville, Texas, where I am from, there's different
- 25 practices, right, of the Catholic religion?

- 1 A. Absolutely, yes.
- 2 Q. Now, you were testifying earlier that -- have you ever
- 3 heard of La Virgen de Guadalupe?
- 4 A. I'm sorry?
- 5 Q. Have you ever heard of La Virgen de Guadalupe?
- 6 THE COURT REPORTER: La what, I'm sorry? La what?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Vatican?
- 8 MR. CANALES: De Guadalupe
- 9 Q. Have you ever heard --
- 10 A. Are you saying Vatican?
- 11 Q. No, Virgen de Guadalupe. Virgen de Guadalupe.
- 12 A. Oh, Virgen de Guadalupe. Yes.
- 13 Q. Okay. Is it familiar for people in the Catholic religion
- 14 to carry -- to carry religious things in their wallet, do you
- 15 know?
- 16 A. I'm not sure.
- 17 Q. Would it surprise you that a lot of Catholics from
- 18 different Hispanic origins would believe in carrying images of
- 19 saints in their wallet?
- 20 A. Of true saints, I agree, yes.
- 21 Q. Well, who determines who's a true saint?
- 22 A. Well, I think the Vatican of the Catholic church condones
- 23 the cult of Santa Muerte.
- 24 Q. Okay. Do you know who's the Virgen de San Juan?
- 25 A. I'm sorry?

- 1 Q. Do you know who's the Virgen de San Juan?
- 2 A. No, sir.
- 3 Q. Would it surprise you that she's got thousands and
- 4 thousands of followers among the Catholic people from Texas,
- 5 South Texas all the way down to Mexico?
- 6 A. Not knowing her, I can't answer that educationally.
- 7 Q. There was a pole camera that was installed, right, on
- 8 this property?
- 9 A. Yes, sir, in the vicinity of his property.
- 10 Q. Okay. Would you please tell this jury -- would you
- 11 elaborate to the jury what's a pole camera.
- 12 A. It is a camera utilized that has the appearance of a
- 13 junction box on a telephone pole that is utilized to be able
- 14 to view certain things in said area. It's a discreet camera.
- 15 Q. Okay. So was there a street camera in this property?
- 16 A. To my knowledge there was a camera across the street.
- 17 Q. Would you please point.
- 18 A. I don't know the exact location.
- 19 Q. Okay. But obviously, if there's a camera -- how long was
- 20 this camera used?
- 21 A. It was -- I think it was used a little before I got
- 22 involved in the true depths of the case so I couldn't say
- 23 exactly how long the camera was utilized.
- 24 Q. Would it be fair to say it had been there for months?
- 25 A. Weeks -- weeks is fair to say to my knowledge.

- 1 Q. At least weeks, right?
- 2 A. For several weeks.
- 3 Q. So it would be fair to say that if there was evidence of
- 4 my client drug dealing, of cars coming in and out all times of
- 5 | night or money being exchanged, I mean, it would be recorded
- 6 on that camera, right? It would be fair to bring it to the
- 7 jury so the jury can see, hey, we were watching for 24 hours
- 8 for several weeks. This is -- this is the evidence that we
- 9 have that we got when we watched it on camera?
- 10 A. If it were caught on camera and if it were done at that
- 11 house in the day.
- 12 Q. Well, I mean, certainly the camera would catch lights of
- 13 cars at night?
- 14 A. I'm not sure we had a recording mechanism on the camera.
- 15 It was probably identification.
- 16 Q. Somebody was watching -- I'm sorry for interrupting you.
- 17 Somebody was watching it, right?
- 18 A. That's okay.
- 19 Unfortunately, we didn't have it manned 24/7. It's a
- 20 small town sheriff's office. Short man staff of the DEA. We
- 21 didn't have it manned.
- 22 \(\begin{aligned} \text{O}. \quad \text{Okay}. \quad \text{Were we watching or were we not watching?} \end{aligned} \)
- 23 A. I was not ever watching.
- 24 Q. Somebody was responsible for watching, right?
- 25 A. At certain times I'm sure they were watching.

- 1 Q. It wasn't my client who was responsible for that, right?
- 2 He wasn't responsible for the camera, right? It was the
- 3 authorities.
- 4 A. Of placing the camera?
- 5 0. Yes.
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. And it was the authorities who would decide to bring that
- 8 as evidence or not bring it as evidence, right?
- 9 A. Lot of times it's used for identification purposes,
- 10 vehicles driven, other cars coming out -- in and out of the
- 11 area. And it would just be simply individuals noticed, two
- 12 white pickups, one Chevrolet Blazer, that kind of stuff.
- 13 Q. I mean, how many times --
- 14 **A.** If --
- 15 Q. If Bobby Shore is visiting or Bobby Shore is sitting on
- 16 the porch drinking a beer with my client because they're
- 17 friends or if Eller goes there during the day because they are
- 18 | having a barbecue and they know each other. I mean, that
- 19 would be important for the jury to see, right, if it was
- 20 caught on tape?
- 21 A. I'm sorry?
- 22 \ 0. If it was caught on tape, it would be important for the
- 23 jury to see that, right?
- 24 A. If it were caught on tape --
- 25 Q. Right.

- 1 A. -- yeah, we would probably bring it.
- 2 Q. Okay.

3

- A. Again, I --
- 4 Q. Do I have possession of that camera?
- A. I'm not sure we have any recorded -- matter of fact,
- 6 there was no recorded images from the camera to my knowledge.
- 7 Q. Okay. But the ability to watch was there, right?
- 8 A. I'm sorry?
- 9 Q. The ability to watch, see what Saldana is doing for 24
- 10 hours a day or at least during the day hours for several weeks
- 11 was there.
- 12 A. If we had the manpower, yes, sir.
- 13 Q. The people that are going to come -- some of the people
- 14 that are going to come and testify today, like Eller, Shore,
- 15 Caudell, and the Pinas and Hawkins, what are they referred to
- 16 as?
- 17 A. I'm sorry? Witnesses.
- Q. Witnesses? But on the street what are they known as? Or
- 19 in jail what are they known as?
- 20 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Caudell, Pina, Shore. I'm sorry, I
- 22 \blacksquare may not understand the question.
- 23 Q. Okay. Your witnesses, the ones that have --
- 24 MR. KAUFMAN: Objection. Characterization among
- 25 individuals in the jail are not relevant to this case, Your

1 Honor.

4

5

6

12

2 MR. CANALES: Your Honor, obviously this type of -3 THE COURT: Overruled.

- Q. Obviously cooperating witnesses are different from a lay witness, right?
- A. Cooperating defendants and cooperating witnesses, yes.
- Q. Meaning, an old lady comes to court or a teacher or an electrician or realtor person comes to court and says I saw this. I was -- for whatever reason I have nothing to do with this case. I have nothing to do with anything. I have nothing to gain. That's a straight witness, right? A lay
- 13 A. It's a witness for us, yes, sir.
- Q. But in this case the people coming forward today, those are not lay witnesses, right?
- 16 A. I wouldn't characterize them as not lay or unlay.
- 17 They're a witness.

witness, right?

- 18 Q. How would you characterize them as?
- A. They're witnesses for us. And trust me, we discussed the case in the last couple weeks and we would say, you know, I'm going to put this witness on. I'm not going to put this witness on. So that's really how we talk about the witnesses.
- Q. Okay. Would you -- would you characterize them as witnesses with a vested interest to testify?
- 25 A. Again, if we want to go through it again, it's witnesses

- 1 with the hope of consideration.
- 2 Q. All right.
- 3 A. I can't dress it up any further.
- 4 Q. Now -- so you also talked about -- about phone records
- 5 | earlier, right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Now, given the fact that Bobby -- that Mr. Eller is from
- 8 Ashe County --
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. -- given the fact that Bobby Shore is from Ashe County,
- 11 given the fact that my client has been residing in that county
- 12 for years also, would it be uncommon for them to have each
- 13 other's phone number in that context? Is that -- I mean, is
- 14 | that uncommon?
- 15 A. In certain circumstances it is uncommon. And I can
- 16 explain if you would like. I have a biker individual in touch
- 17 with a Mexican in touch with a -- it just -- it was a little
- 18 ddd. Not saying they couldn't be in touch. Just explaining
- 19 the differences that we would say, like, it's a little...
- 20 Q. And again, they could have a lot of similarities. I
- 21 | mean --
- 22 A. Sure.
- 23 Q. -- right?
- But the one thing that we're bringing forward or the
- 25 government is bringing forward is the fact that they knew each

- 1 other and they're from the same area, correct?
- 2 A. A little bit more we're bringing forward.
- 3 Q. And they all did drugs, basically.
- 4 A. I'm sorry?
- 5 Q. That's another thing in common, right?
- 6 A. That they all got their drugs from a certain person.
 - Q. Well, that's assuming they're telling the truth, right?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.

7

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 9 MR. CANALES: No further questions, Your Honor.
- 10 Pass the witness.
- MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

Mr. Shore were in any way untrue?

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KAUFMAN:

- Q. Agent Harmon, you were asked repeatedly regarding your perception of what the truth is from various witnesses in this case. The defense didn't ask you about your perception of the truth of the recordings with the defendant on December 11th and December 12th of 2012. Do you have any reason to believe those recordings between the defendant and Mr. Eller on the 11th of December and the recording between the defendant and
- 22 A. No, sir.
- 23 Q. You were initially asked about whether you were relying
- 24 on the Pinas in terms of deciding to arrest the defendant.
- 25 \parallel Was that the only reason based on what the Pinas said that you

- 1 arrested the defendant?
- 2 A. No, sir. The defendant was arrested before I talked to
- 3 the Pinas.
- 4 Q. And since the defense asked you about that, why did you?
- 5 A. I'm sorry?
- 6 Q. Why did you? The defense asked --
- 7 \blacksquare A. Why did I?
- 8 Q. Yeah, why did you arrest the defendant?
- 9 A. Because I had information he was moving large amounts of
- 10 methamphetamine in the Western District of North Carolina and
- 11 Virginia, both districts.
- 12 Q. And what information was that?
- 13 A. I'm sorry?
- 14 Q. What information specifically?
- 15 A. Based on analytical data from cooperating defendants,
- 16 cooperating sources, information gleaned from other
- 17 investigations and in surrounding areas, law enforcement
- 18 officials in the Western District of Virginia, law enforcement
- 19 officials in Ashe County, and then put together an
- 20 investigation against Mr. Saldana.
- 21 Q. All right. Now, by the way, with regard to these -- you
- 22 mentioned other investigations. The defense lawyer asked you
- 23 whether certain individuals were part of the same indictment
- 24 that Mr. Saldana is. I believe that they specifically asked
- 25 you about Ms. Caudell, about Mr. Hawkins. Can people be in

- 1 different indictments but in the same conspiracy?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. Is that what the case is here?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. While the DEA -- you were leading the DEA component of
- 6 this investigation, in the same general area of Ashe County
- 7 and other neighboring counties, were there any other federal
- 8 agencies from the Charlotte area investigating methamphetamine
- 9 trafficking?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. And in fact, are you familiar with an investigation by
- 12 | Homeland Security?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. To include Special Agent Joe Barringer who was mentioned
- 15 as one of the potential witnesses in this case although he's
- 16 unlikely to be called?
- 17 A. Yes, sir, I am.
- 18 **Q.** And in fact, did Agent Barringer lead to the arrest and
- 19 then eventual guilty plea by Mr. Hawkins?
- 20 A. Yes, in the concurrent methamphetamine -- federal
- 21 methamphetamine investigation.
- 22 0. And had Mr. Hawkins, in fact, been arrested well before
- 23 Mr. Saldana?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. You were asked about some of the language of the

- 1 | indictment. Who drafts up the indictment?
- 2 A. Like I told Mr. Canales, I wish I had the answer for you.
- 3 I do not know, but I assume it's the U.S. Attorney's Office.
- 4 Somebody compartmentalized in your office or maybe you.
 - Q. Or maybe me?
- 6 A. Sure.

5

- 7 \mathbb{Q} . So if my signature appears on the indictment, does that
- 8 mean I'm the one who drafted it, not you?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. All right. You were asked about whether the drug
- 11 trafficking conspiracy, what we call the objects of the scheme
- 12 and the specific actions of this conspiracy, whether it
- 13 involved importation. And then you were confronted with how
- 14 | it may have involved distribution and possession with intent
- 15 to distribute but not by name importation.
- Do the facts of your investigation support that he did,
- 17 | in fact, import?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. And what facts are those?
- 20 A. The fact that we were dealing with pound amounts of
- 21 methamphetamine.
- MR. CANALES: Your Honor, I'm going to object if
- 23 he's going to testify as to hearsay.
- MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor --
- MR. CANALES: If he's going to testify -- if he's

got personal knowledge, then, yes, those questions can be asked. But for him to testify to something that maybe other officers have heard somewhere else and through the grapevine is passed to him. I mean, I ask that whatever it is, that he have personal knowledge of whatever he's going to testify.

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, the defense was -- I was objecting routinely during the cross examination. The defense has been opening the door repeatedly asking these kinds of open-ended questions of the witness regarding his investigations, why he made decisions that he made, why he did and didn't do certain things. So I think this is fair game.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.

MR. CANALES: Thank you, Your Honor.

- Q. (By Mr. Kaufman) Your understanding of importation, would that be included in what you defined as drug trafficking?
- A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. Now, you were asked repeatedly whether certain
 individuals were honest people. As a threshold matter, do you
 think -- do you ordinarily refer to people who are selling
 drugs as honest people?
- 21 A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
- Q. Well, if somebody is selling methamphetamine or trafficking in drugs, do you ordinarily characterize them as honest people?
- 25 A. I'm sure that they can sell methamphetamine honestly, but

- I wouldn't characterize them as an honest person because they sell methamphetamine.
 - Q. Now, when you are considering whether to rely in part based on numerous factors in an investigation, but to use a particular individual as a potential witness, to gather information from and further the investigation, what's the
- 8 A. Corroboration.

most important thing in your mind?

to us.

Q. Okay. Let's talk about corroboration. You were asked if all of the potential witnesses in the case, whether they were honest people. And you were stating whether you believed certain people were or were not honest people.

First of all, putting aside the generalization, what was that conclusion based on? For example, for Mr. Shore.

- A. Speaking with Mr. Shore subsequent to his arrest.
- 16 0. And how did corroboration fit into that?
 - A. He explained to me what I already knew, the majority of the case concerning Mr. Shore. Obviously, we didn't pick his name out of a phone book per se. We went there because we knew what he had been doing, who he had been purchasing methamphetamine off of. He corroborated it by explaining it
 - Q. When you do an interview of a cooperating witness or confidential source, confidential informant, do you -- what is the direction of the information flow, if that makes sense?

- 1 A. I let them speak.
- 2 Q. Do you ever give them any facts about your investigation?
- 3 A. No, I make that -- as a matter of fact, it's an uncommon
- 4 practice.

5

- \square Q. Why is that?
- 6 A. Just because someone may be fishing for information that
- 7 we have or what we're doing. So I may divulge something in an
- 8 investigation that doesn't need to be out there for the
- 9 general public at that time.
- 10 Q. You mentioned that you got information from Mr. Shore
- 11 even though you already knew the answer. Why do you do that?
- 12 A. Why do I do that? For corroboration. To prove that he's
- 13 going -- and I'll explain it to them. Say, look, you've
- 14 got -- there's a lot of things I'll ask you that I already
- 15 know the truth to or know the answers to. You've got to tell
- 16 me the truth so we can decide what information we can use from
- 17 your statements. And he was -- he laid it out to -- in
- 18 general exactly what we knew to be happening in purchasing the
- 19 methamphetamine.
- 20 Q. And is that the way that you do your interviews? Do you
- 21 do it in a relatively standardized way?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Why is that?
- 24 A. So I can do it the same way every time.
- 25 Q. And the methods that you use, is that based on your

- 1 training in law enforcement?
- 2 A. Sure it is. Training and experience.
- Q. And you accompany, I take it, other law enforcement
- 4 officials in their interviews?
- 5 A. Yes, sir.
- 6 Q. And have you found that to be the standard operating
- 7 procedure not only for you but for others?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. Did you have objective evidence that corroborated
- 10 Mr. Shore?
- 11 A. I'm sorry, like...
- 12 Q. Well, how did the recording that Mr. Shore --
- 13 A. Oh, yes.
- 14 Q. -- made, how did that play into your decision making?
- 15 A. Mr. Shore explained to us what had happened in the past,
- 16 how he had been dealing in methamphetamine.
- 17 MR. CANALES: I'm going to object for him to testify
- 18 as to what Mr. Shore will testify.
- 19 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 20 THE WITNESS: We took that information, elected to
- 21 give Mr. Shore a body wire because he had corroborated what I
- 22 knew in the investigation, sent him in to the residence of
- 23 Mr. Saldana for further corroboration. So the two married up
- 24 perfectly.
- 25 Q. In terms of Mr. Eller, did you obtain any corroboration

- 1 from him?
- 2 A. Same thing.
- 3 Q. When you say the same thing, what?
- 4 A. We spoke to Mr. Eller. We knew what the facts were of
- 5 the case. We married the two with facts from this case, from
- 6 other enforcement activities, from other cooperating
- 7 defendants who were cooperating sources of information,
- 8 married that up with what we knew in the investigation, and
- 9 sent him in with a body wire also. The body wire, the
- 10 recording further corroborated what we knew, what he had
- 11 already said.
- 12 Q. So when, for example, Mr. Eller was arrested on
- 13 October 26, 2012, was Mr. Hawkins in the room, Ms. Caudell in
- 14 the room, Mr. Shore in the room, Mr. Jose Pina, Sr., in the
- 15 room?
- 16 A. No, sir.
- 17 Q. So is there any way that any of those individuals could
- 18 ∥ have told him what to say when he was speaking with law
- 19 enforcement on October 26, 2012?
- 20 A. No, sir.
- 21 Q. Same question for Mr. Shore. When he was arrested on
- 22 October -- sorry, on December 12 of 2012, were any of the
- 23 other cooperating witnesses in the room with him to tell him
- 24 their version of the facts?
- 25 A. No, sir.

- Q. You were asked a lot of questions about the motivations of cooperating witnesses when they testified.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Let's touch upon that just a little bit. The defense asked you whether the United States files a motion asking the
- 6 court to reduce an individual's sentence for providing
- 7 truthful testimony. Do you remember when you were asked about
- 8 that?

3

- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Okay. Who ultimately decides whether to grant that
- 11 | motion at all?
- 12 A. I do not. The U.S. Attorney's Office.
- 13 Q. Well, to grant the motion, who decides?
- 14 A. Oh, to grant the motion, the courts.
- 15 Q. Okay. When you say "the courts," for -- except for
- 16 Ms. Caudell who's already in the Bureau of Prisons, but for
- 17 these other witnesses that we've discussed today, do you know
- 18 ₩ which judge it is who makes that decision as to whether their
- 19 testimony was truthful and whether to give a downward
- 20 departure?
- 21 A. His Honor.
- 22 Q. His Honor. Can you say their name, please?
- 23 A. Mr. Voorhees. Judge Voorhees.
- 24 Q. Judge Voorhees. Okay. Now, who is the one who decides
- 25 \parallel whether -- the amount, if any, that their sentence gets

- 1 reduced to?
- 2 A. Judge Voorhees.
- 3 Q. And you've talked about how you explain the risks and the
- 4 benefits to potential witnesses. Can you be specific. You
- 5 talked -- you started to relate a little bit about what
- 6 happens if they say anything that is anything but truthful.
- 7 If somebody -- if a witness says something that's not
- 8 I truthful --
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. -- what do you tell them would happen?
- 11 A. I explain to them that they are facing another charge if
- 12 they tell -- if they come into our court -- or into court
- 13 during our case and explain something that is not the truth,
- 14 that they will receive another charge. There's a possibility
- 15 that they would get another charge put on them.
- 16 Q. So are you familiar with the term perjury?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. Obstruction of justice?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. Contempt of court?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 0. Did any of those expressions come into that conversation?
- 23 A. Sure.
- 24 Q. And what, if anything, do you explain will happen to them
- 25 in terms of the plea agreement that they already have?

- 1 A. We actually tell them we'll rip it up, shred it up. It
- 2 will be null and void if they compromise the plea agreement by
- 3 not telling the truth.
- 4 Q. And you were asked some details about what one witness's
- 5 plea agreement might have had or another witness's plea
- 6 agreement might have. Are you involved in any way in the
- 7 drafting or review of plea agreements?
- 8 A. No, sir.
- 9 Q. Are any agents ever involved in that process?
- 10 A. No, sir.
- 11 Q. You were asked a lot of questions about the two Pinas,
- 12 the father and son. First of all, you were confronted with
- 13 the idea that the son in his plea agreement received a role
- 14 reduction.
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. And is that a decision you would make?
- 17 A. No, sir.
- 18 Q. Is that a decision I would make?
- 19 A. For role reduction?
- 20 Q. Yes.
- 21 A. To offer the role reduction, but not grant a role
- 22 reduction.
- 23 Q. Okay. And because the role reduction is ultimately
- 24 granted or not granted by the court, right?
- 25 A. By the court, Judge Voorhees, yes, sir.

- Q. Now, if Mr. -- if the junior, the son, actually did receive a role reduction, would that be consistent with your understanding of the facts of the case?
- 4 \blacksquare A. If he received a role --
 - Q. If he were to receive a role reduction.
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. So it wouldn't be some sort of overly favorable deal. It 8 would -- would it be a fair characterization of the actual
- 9 case?

5

- 10 A. Sure, absolutely.
- 11 Q. And if all of the other witnesses had received -- had
- 12 pled guilty to over 500 grams of methamphetamine but Mr. Jose
- 13 Pina, Jr., pled to a lesser amount of drugs, would that be
- 14 consistent with your investigation as well?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. You were asked about who took the money from the property
- 17 after the December 12th, 2012 arrest, and you were confronted
- 18 with the money that Mr. Jose Pina Sr.'s, girlfriend had
- 19 obtained.
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Did you also receive any other information about any
- 22 other individuals who took money from the property?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. Who were they?
- 25 A. Mr. --

MR. CANALES: Judge -- Judge, I would ask if this witness testifies, he's got personal knowledge of his testimony, Judge, or is this something he heard through the grapevine?

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, Your Honor, the question the defense asked was his understanding as to who took money from the property to include Ms. Blevins, Jose Sr.'s girlfriend. It's the same issue.

MR. CANALES: But that's because Pina, the boyfriend, who's a cooperating witness, was the one that told him, Judge, at a debrief. So he had personal knowledge because he was present and so he could testify to that.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. KAUFMAN: And so, Your Honor, from the same source, we're asking from the same source that the defense has already asked.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.

MR. CANALES: Thank you, Judge.

- Q. (By Mr. Kaufman) You were asked about immigration -potential immigration charges against the Pinas. Agent
 Harmon, based on your training and experience, would an
 immigration charge against anybody increase their sentence at
 all if they're pleading to a drug charge?
- 24 A. No, sir.

25 Q. You were confronted with the concept that after the

- 1 December arrest, that Mr. Pina, Sr., did not, in fact,
- 2 actually meet with you and debrief with you until
- 3 approximately two months later. Based on your training and
- 4 experience, would you characterize that as normal, relatively
- 5 **|** quickly, relatively slowly?
- 6 A. That's -- that time frame, relatively quickly considering
- 7 the holidays. It was relatively quickly for a proffered
- 8 interview.
- 9 Q. And there are legal procedures that have to happen before
- 10 that to include the plea and organizing lawyers' schedules; is
- 11 | that right?
- 12 A. And I'm the last one to know, yes, sir.
- 13 Q. You were asked about Mr. Saldana's income, and you were
- 14 asked whether it was true that his income was between 45 and
- 15 50 thousand dollars. But did you, in fact, obtain from his
- 16 own residence tax records regarding his income at Adams
- 17 | Construction?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. And did those documents, in fact, indicate a far lower
- 20 number?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 about that it was?
- 24 A. I don't remember. Twenty, thirty thousand.
- 25 Q. Okay. So -- okay.

- 1 A. It's been several years. I do not remember the exact 2 amount, I apologize.
 - Q. Now, the defense asked you if you knew about his
- 4 employment at Adams Construction. What, if any, other
- 5 information had led you to that understanding that he worked
- 6 there?

- 7 A. Simply because of the fact that he was distributing drugs
- 8 at that employment place.
- 9 Q. Now, the defense was asking you about his financial need
- 10 based on that employment and you testified that he no longer
- 11 had that job. I think -- was it after 2011?
- 12 A. He told me after 2011 he quit his job.
- Q. Okay. Did he tell you whether he had any other sort of
- 14 | legitimate employment after that?
- 15 A. No, sir.
- 16 Q. Have you ever experienced -- based on your training and
- 17 experience, have you ever had people who actually have an
- 18 otherwise legitimate job but also sell drugs?
- 19 A. Absolutely.
- 20 Q. You were asked whether you did any wiretaps of
- 21 Mr. Saldana. Is a wiretap an easy thing to get?
- 22 A. No, sir, not very common --
- 23 Q. Is that something you can do on your own?
- 24 A. -- in the Western District of North Carolina.
- 25 I'm sorry, ahead.

- 1 **|** Q. Is a wiretap something you can do on your own?
- 2 A. No, sir.

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q. Can you explain to the jury the process and what's involved and what's required in order to get a wiretap.
 - A. It's a lengthy, painstaking process, if I can be so blunt about it. It's a process that I'm not against considering the case is favorable for a wiretap. But it takes a lot of manpower and a lot of issues before you can ever initiate the wire interception and the wiretap of that particular phone. It's very lengthy and drawn out and, quite frankly, not out of the question in this case. We just were forced -- our hand
- was forced because of the fact that we got information from his mouth that he was leaving that night. We had to make an arrest.
- 15 Q. Who has to approve a wiretap anyway?
- 16 A. A judge.
- 17 Q. Does Washington, DC, get involved in all wiretaps?
- A. Yes, sir. You have to send off your draft, 30, 40 page write-up to Washington, DC, and bureaucracy at its best gets involved. And DC sends it back to you and says make these changes. You send it back to DC and DC sends it back to you
- 22 and you take it to the judge. It's pretty drawn out.
- Q. How did the fact you discovered Mr. Saldana was going back to Mexico impact your decision to apply for a wiretap?
- 25 A. Especially that night in question because of the

- recording that we made the day before, the intelligence that we were getting, the recording that we made on that day about Mr. Saldana's concerns for law enforcement and detection, and the recording of Mr. Saldana saying, Don't tell anybody, but I'm going to back to Mexico. And when I heard that, I knew that we needed to act fast, and we did.
 - Q. How did your understanding as to Mr. Jose Pina, Sr.'s, involvement as a seller for Mr. Saldana play into your decision as to whether or not it would be fruitful to do a wiretap of Mr. Saldana's phone?
- 11 Yeah, it was -- it was based on the fact that -- again, I mentioned this early on in the testimony. A lot of times 12 13 they'll insulate themselves from talking on certain phones or letting a lower member of the organization do the distributing 14 15 for them. However, the case showed that Mr. Martinez was delivering methamphetamine or selling methamphetamine also, 16 17 but it also evolved into Mr. Pina taking care of that business for him when he went back to Mexico. 18
- 19 Q. Are you familiar with the term "two dirty calls"?
- 20 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- 21 0. What's that?
- A. It's something that's a requisite in the fact when you apply for a wiretap, you have to have certain dirty calls -- a minimum number of dirty calls that would happen to -- have to happen on that telephone specifically.

- 1 Q. Can you describe what a dirty call is.
- 2 A. Yeah, I apologize. A dirty call, someone saying, hey --
- 3 a dirty call is an incriminating phone call made by the target
- 4 telephone which would be the telephone in question and that
- 5 dirty call or the incriminating call must involve certain --
- 6 has to have certain requisite elements to include pretty laid
- 7 out verbal conversation of I will move the drugs here, I will
- 8 sell the drugs to you, that kind of call that we didn't have
- 9 also.
- 10 Q. Is that often obtained by having an informant call the
- 11 target of the investigation and obtain a dirty call that way?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. When Mr. Eller tried to make phone calls to Mr. Saldana,
- 14 what happened? And in fact, to Mr. Pina.
- 15 A. Mr. Pina, yeah, didn't answer.
- 16 Q. So did you have any dirty calls on which to go up on a
- 17 | wiretap?
- 18 A. No, sir.
- 19 Q. With regard to the pole camera, I believe you testified
- 20 | that it wasn't actually on Mr. Saldana's property; is that
- 21 right?
- 22 A. Right.
- 23 0. It was across the street.
- 24 A. Across the street, yes, sir.
- 25 Q. So would that pole camera have been able -- based on your

- training and experience, are there times based on the
 topography and the neighborhood that it's simply impossible to
 get a valuable pole camera put up?
 - A. Absolutely. It's more common than not.
- Q. And so based on the placement of the pole camera in this case, was it actually going to be able to capture any
- 7 | hand-to-hand transactions in the residence?
- 8 A. No, sir.

4

9

16

- Q. Any near the outside of the residence on the property?
- 10 A. Again, I say no. I think that it was more for
- 11 intelligence purposes of types of vehicles that were coming in
- 12 and out of the property just because of the general nature of
- 13 how far back it was sitting.

camera as to their value?

- Q. And is that quite common in law enforcement to use various techniques, but to assess them such as this pole
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. You were asked whether you reviewed the sawed-off shotgun
- 19 in this case, the short-barreled shotgun, and you said that
- 20 you hadn't. Why not?
- 21 A. There's a special agent with Alcohol, Tobacco and
- 22 Firearms that is also assigned to this case that was there
- 23 that night. I like to fancy myself as knowing a lot, but, you
- 24 know, that's his specialty and that's what he's doing in this
- 25 case.

- Q. And is that also common for the subject matter expert to be the one to do the review?
- 3 A. Yes, sir.
- 4 Q. Are you aware of whether he conducted a test fire of all
- 5 the weapons to see if they were operable?
- 6 A. I'm not -- I'm not sure.
- 7 Q. You were asked about the caliber of the three handguns
- 8 that were found in the defendant's room to include the one
- 9 between the mattress and the box spring.
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Based on your understanding, you said -- did you say you
- 12 were an aficionado of firearms?
- 13 A. No, Mr. Canales --
- 14 Q. Oh, I'm sorry.
- 15 ▮A. -- stated that, but --
- 16 Q. But based on your understanding, can a .22 caliber bullet
- 17 | kill a man?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. You were asked about what you would expect to find in the
- 20 defendant's home. Would you have expected to -- the idea that
- 21 people in the Ashe County area may possess firearms, would you
- 22 expect to find a short-barreled shotgun?
- 23 A. Not at all.
- 24 Q. Regarding Santa Muerte, how often have you debriefed with
- 25 drug traffickers regarding the Santa Muerte?

- A. I've had several debriefs of drug traffickers and cooperating defendants, cooperating sources. Just recently had a cooperating source go in with an individual where the individual made him pray with him before -- or pray as they asked for protection during a drug transaction.
 - Q. During any of your debriefs -- you were asked a lot of -some questions about a lot of other saints and virgin figures
 in Catholicism. The Virgin of Guadalupe and some others.

 During any of your debriefings with drug traffickers, have
 these other images and concepts ever come up as being
 associated with drug trafficking?
 - A. No, sir.

- Q. And you were asked about your decision to arrest the defendant on that date, December 12th, 2012. And the defense pointed out that the defendant had been consistent with the information you received from CS's, CI's, cooperating witnesses, that the defendant had been going back and forth between Mexico. What, if anything, about the statements the defendant made in that Shore recording with Mr. Shore was different?
 - A. It was very different. Again, I reiterate that he was acknowledging law enforcement detection. He was acknowledging the fact that Mr. Eller may be cooperating against him. He acknowledged the fact that he was afraid somebody was going to squeal on him. He was afraid that somebody was going to

tell -- that they were going to tell on him, the people that
were getting arrested, and that he was going back to Mexico.

With the totality of the circumstances at that point and
several other statements made during that conversation and the
conversation on the 11th of December, we made the decision to
arrest Mr. Saldana.

MR. KAUFMAN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. CANALES: If I may just very shortly.

THE COURT: Yes, sir.

MR. CANALES: Okay.

RECROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. CANALES:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- Q. Officer, on the issue of -- I'll come back to the issue of beliefs and stuff and all that, but let me ask you about this.
- 17 Debriefs, right?
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 0. Debriefs.
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. Is a person -- isn't it correct that when there's a
- 22 debrief, usually -- debrief meaning when a person is
- 23 cooperating, giving testimony to the authorities, right?
- 24 Usually are lawyers present?
- 25 A. I'm sorry, are debriefs --

- 1 Isn't it true that lawyers are always present? Q. Yes.
- 2 Α. No, sir.
- You mean to tell me that in the state of North Carolina 3
- 4 in federal court when cooperating agents or people, defendants
- 5 cooperate, they sit down without a lawyer?
- 6 Α. Yes, sir.
- 7 So when Bobby Shore spoke, there was not a lawyer Ο.
- present? 8

15

16

- 9 Are you asking about proffers? Α.
- 10 Q. I'm talking about cooperation.
- 11 Α. Subsequent to arrest?
- 12 Q. Debriefs. Debriefs.

what that is.

- 13 THE COURT: Well, wait just a minute. You mentioned the word "proffer" several times. Why don't you tell the jury 14
- THE WITNESS: It's an agreement that the courts 17 use -- I'm sorry, that the -- it's an agreement between the
- 18 defense and the U.S. Attorney's Office that their client, the
- 19 defense client will come in and give a proffer of their
- 20 information regarding their involvement in the case. That
- 21 will not be used against them in the court proceedings.
- 22 They're also reminded not to speak of anything of a violent
- 23 nature, killings or anything like that. It's just a simple
- 24 proffer of information that they provide to the government
- with their attorneys present during a proffer. And I'm sure

- 1 that they may call it something different in different
- 2 localities so it's no -- nothing different. It's just that a
- 3 proffer occurs with an agreement between the U.S. Attorney's
- 4 Office and the defense counsel to -- for their client to
- 5 provide information.
- 6 Q. To make it more clear to the jury, I mean, Danny Eller
- 7 was represented by a lawyer in court, right, when he pled
- 8 guilty?
- 9 A. When he pled -- I'm assuming that he was, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. I mean, right? The honorable judge would have never
- 11 allowed anybody to plead guilty without the assistance of a
- 12 attorney, right?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. True or not true?
- 15 A. I'm sure that they can represent themselves.
- 16 Q. Okay. But do you have --
- 17 A. I'm just saying -- you're asking me to definitively say
- 18 people can't plead guilty without a lawyer. I think that
- 19 that's not the truth.
- 20 Q. Let me get case specific. In this case isn't it true
- 21 that when Bobby Shore, Danny Eller, the Pinas, when they pled
- 22 | quilty, they were assisted by a lawyer, true or not true?
- 23 A. To my knowledge, yes, sir.
- 24 Q. And isn't it true that the one that negotiated the plea
- 25 bargain agreements for Eller, for Shore, for the Pinas, and

- for Caudell was the attorney dealing with the U.S. Attorney's

 Office? It's the attorney who makes the plea bargain

 agreements with the U.S. Attorney's Office like in this case,
- 5 A. In my understanding.

4

6

7

8

right?

- Q. Okay. And it is the attorneys also who also have an understanding as to whether or not a benefit is going to be derived from their testimony, right?
- 9 \blacksquare A. The attorneys decide that?
- Q. I mean, the attorneys are present and it's negotiated through the U.S. Attorney's Office whether a motion for downward departure is going to be filed.
- A. Maybe I should explain the process a little bit more because the defense attorney sits with the U.S. Attorney's Office and they negotiate outside of the presence of a DEA agent or an ATF agent or an HSI agent. They negotiate and decide what's best for their client with the U.S. Attorney's Office during this plea agreement. I'm not privy to that
- conversation nor the granting because I know that granting the plea is ultimately up to His Honor.
- Q. I really would like for us to get case specific on this case.
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Not other cases or how it happens generally. But on this case, plea bargains were struck; is that correct, for all of

- 1 them?
- 2 A. They pled guilty. The only one going to trial is
- 3 Mr. Saldana.
- 4 Q. Okay. My question, sir, again, is isn't it true that all
- 5 of them cut deals, all of them had plea bargain agreements in
- 6 writing with certain benefits in that writing?
- 7 A. That's fair to say that they pled guilty.
- 8 0. Is it fair to say that's the truth in this case?
- 9 A. That they pled guilty. I don't know what bargains that
- 10 you're speaking of.
- 11 Q. All right. That's fair. And you know a lot about the
- 12 aspects of the investigation, right, in this case?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. And you were asked questions right now -- let me give an
- 15 example of what happens in the debriefs or when a client is
- 16 cooperating. When a person is cooperating, who's asking the
- 17 questions? Is an officer asking the questions to elicit
- 18 information from a possible...
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. Right?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 0. I mean, an officer has a target, right? And then when
- 23 you speak to a person, it is the officer who is asking the
- 24 questions and decides what route that question is going to
- 25 take, right?

- 1 A. General questions.
- 2 Q. Right? Now, in this case --
- 3 A. Personally I do not -- in this case, case specific, I do
- 4 not lead down any road. I ask generally. General questions.
- 5 Q. Okay. Let me ask you about this one. Have you spoken to
- 6 Caudell, Clara Caudell?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Okay. When was the first time you spoke to her?
- 9 A. The date? I spoke to her only one time so I would have
- 10 to refer to my notes to know the exact date.
- 11 Q. Okay.
- 12 A. Maybe July.
- 13 Q. Of this year?
- 14 A. No, no, no.
- 15 Q. Last year?
- 16 A. 2012.
- 17 Q. 2012. But then by July of 2012 Saldana was already
- 18 ∥arrested. So he was more than a target; he was a defendant,
- 19 | right?
- 20 A. July 2012?
- 21 Q. I mean, excuse me, by July of 2012 -- I apologize. July
- 22 \blacksquare of 2012 when you spoke to Ms. Caudell, my client was already a
- 23 target.
- 24 A. A target of the investigation?
- 25 Q. Yes. He was a target because you testified earlier that

- 1 when you got here --
- 2 A. Sure.
- 3 Q. -- he was already given to you, right?
- 4 A. Sure.
- 5 Q. As a target.
- 6 A. Sure.
- 7 Q. Okay. And when you spoke to Bobby Shore, when was that?
- 8 A. December 12th, 2012.
- 9 Q. That was the first time you spoke to Bobby?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 \ Q. Well, isn't -- my client was more than a target on
- 12 December 12. He was arrested on December 12.
- 13 A. Not before I spoke to Bobby Shore.
- 14 Q. I mean, minutes before, hours before he gets arrested?
- 15 A. No, I spoke to Bobby Shore on the morning of December 12
- 16 and that night he was arrested. So yeah, specifically you're
- 17 crossing before and after. It was after, yes.
- 18 Q. You met this credible, reliable person and based on this
- 19 information, this drug user, this person, then we arrest
- 20 Mr. Saldana based on a lot of factors.
- 21 A. Corroboration.
- 22 0. Okay. And --
- 23 THE COURT: Counselor, I think we're going to have
- 24 to break it off because it's a quarter after 5:00. We usually
- 25 break at 5:00.

Members of the jury, please hold what you've got, so to speak. Keep an open mind about the case. Don't discuss it. And remember the other instructions. Ask you to be with us at 9:30 in the morning. Come on in the jury room and we'll call for you at that time. Thank you.

(Jury exited the courtroom.)

THE COURT: If I read you correctly, counselor, you have mentioned a number of other areas in addition to the one you are already taking up that you wanted to go into with this witness.

MR. CANALES: Only as to -- only as to what was covered by the government on redirect. Only those areas.

THE COURT: Well, I would ask you to stick to redirect.

MR. CANALES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I don't know that that -- in the light of the fact that we've already covered considerable territory about the nature of the investigation and this witness's role in it, I want you to keep that in mind --

MR. CANALES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- in terms of whether we're beating a dead horse, so to speak, as far as the jury is concerned.

MR. CANALES: Yes, Your Honor. I will -- I specifically labeled my notes redirect subjects that were covered by the prosecutor. And only -- just this much. Yes,

I will -- I will limit it, Judge. I will find a way to clean it up.

THE COURT: That's what I'd ask you to do.

MR. CANALES: Okay.

THE COURT: I don't -- I try not to tell counsel how to try their cases.

MR. CANALES: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And we want you to have adequate scope to bring out things that are important. But when you started going witness by witness over ground that we have covered, that sounded like it might be getting afoul of judicial economy if nothing else. Normally the government has -- well, an attorney who calls a witness normally has the last word with that witness, but in this case we're allowing your response and other questions that you had to the redirect.

Yes, sir.

MR. KAUFMAN: Your Honor, in light of the rather lengthy recross-examination and new topics, I've noted very briefly three areas I would like to ask so far at this point, just very brief one or two questions on each subject matter on re-redirect based on counsel's recross. I promise to be brief.

THE COURT: Well, as I said, you normally would have the last word with your own witness.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: You've already said you may recall this witness. Defense counsel could also recall the witness. So we'll go from there. Thank you all for considering these matters. (Evening recess at 5:21 p.m.) ****

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, Cheryl A. Nuccio, Federal Official Realtime Court Reporter, in and for the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753, Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the stenographically reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter and that the transcript page format is in conformance with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the United States. Dated this 10th day of August 2015. s/Cheryl A. Nuccio Cheryl A. Nuccio, RMR-CRR Official Court Reporter